



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2013

No. 169

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, December 9, 2013, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2013

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 2, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You have blessed us with all good gifts; and this past week, with thankful hearts, we gathered with family and loved ones throughout this great land to celebrate our blessings together.

Bless the Members of the people's House, who have been entrusted with the privilege to serve our Nation, and all Americans in their need. Grant them to work together in respect and affection, and to be faithful in the responsibilities they have been given.

As the end of the first session approaches and much is left to be done, bestow upon them the gifts of wisdom and discernment, that in their words and actions they will do justice, love with mercy, and walk humbly with You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

OBAMACARE IS WRONG SOLUTION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, discussions about health care often turn into discussions about jobs and the economy. The two are undeniably linked. ObamaCare—its unfunded mandates, broken policy incentives, and tax penalty structure—is exacerbating the crisis of underemployment in this country.

My constituent Sandy from Winston-Salem knows this firsthand. She contacted me to share how ObamaCare is impacting adjunct professors in North Carolina community colleges. She said:

Our hours have been cut because of the "Unaffordable Health Care Act." This legislation is the worst thing that could have happened to the average American.

Her story isn't unique. Stories abound of community colleges working to figure out how they will manage to comply with ObamaCare's costly employer mandate. For some, it means cutting part-time employee hours, which shortchanges both workers and students.

Americans care about health care, and they care about jobs. ObamaCare is the wrong solution for both.

OH, WHAT A DEAL

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7367

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the secret nuke deal with Iran over Thanksgiving is “alarming,” sayeth the Saudi prince.

Prime Minister (Neville) Chamberlain would have been proud after the West gave the snake oil salesman of the desert, Mr. Rouhani, exactly what he wanted—time and money—to pursue his quest for nuclear intimidation.

Although the former Czechoslovakia was not in the trade, it looks like the appeasement West was willing to sell out Israel and Saudi Arabia for “peace in our time.” Israel and Saudi Arabia, like the former Czechoslovakia, did not get to vote on this deal of the century. Neither country likes the bad deal because they are the meal in Iran’s hostile appetite.

To make matters worse, Iranian state news reports the United States unfroze \$8 billion in Iranian assets and reduced sanctions even before the United States gave away the farm and the mineral rights. Isn’t that lovely?

Iran left Geneva with a smile, pockets of money, and fewer sanctions. The United States got the promise that Iran will be nice and not nuke its neighbors. Oh, what a deal.

And that’s just the way it is.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, 4 or 5 years ago when health care reform was being talked about on the floor of this House, one of the ideas that the Republicans put forth was increasing competition, the sale of health insurance across State lines. We all see with the sale of automobile insurance, 15 minutes can save you 15 percent. Everybody knows that. Why not afford that same cost savings for people buying health insurance? But the Democrats have never accepted it.

But now the Affordable Care Act requires that some of my constituents in Texas purchase their insurance on the D.C. exchange; clearly, that is selling across State lines. The problem is it is not lower cost; it is higher cost. And the problem is it doesn’t increase your access to a physician; it decreases your access to physicians.

High deductible health plans, I have had a high deductible plan for 15 years. One of the highest deductibles I ever had was last year of \$3,500. That cost now is almost doubled in the bronze plans that are available in the exchange in my district, and we don’t allow constituents to pair that up with a health savings account. If we really wanted to get the correct market incentives, we would allow the pairing of these high deductible plans with the health savings accounts.

What about the fact that 47 percent of people are paying higher premiums,

according to eHealthInsurance? Why don’t we allow them the same deductibility in the small group market that we allow employers in the large group market.

These are just a few of the things that could have been done 4 years ago which were omitted by the Democrats in charge.

SMALL BUSINESSES ARE HURTING

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, small business is the backbone of our economy. America’s greatness is heavily dependent on small businesses’ success in creating jobs.

In South Carolina, small businesses make up half of our economy. Sadly, these hardworking business owners have been suffering devastating setbacks due to the President’s job-destroying policies. More recently, the failed implementation of ObamaCare has forced higher taxes and extensive regulations on these employers. This unfriendly business climate has prevented small business owners from expanding and creating jobs.

When traveling around South Carolina’s Second Congressional District, I continuously hear from small businesses, local chambers of commerce, the National Federation of Independent Business, and employees who are plagued with uncertainty. Smaller paychecks, inability to meet insurance requirements, and reduced hours are some of the concerns. Congress must work together to replace ObamaCare with commonsense solutions, as long proposed by Congressman TOM PRICE of Georgia.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations Connor Shaw, Jadeveon Clowney, Coach Steve Spurrier, and President Harris Pastides for the Gamecock victory Saturday.

EXTENDING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this countdown clock at democrats.waysandmeans.house.gov says 25 days and 10 hours, and it is ticking. That is the countdown to an immediate cutoff of emergency unemployment insurance for 1.3 million Americans. Without an extension of this vital program, they will lose their entire coverage—every dime of it.

Who are they? They are Americans laid off through no fault of their own, struggling to find jobs and recover from the worst economic crisis in 70 years. They are an estimated 20,000 veterans who have exhausted their State

benefits after leaving the military and are unable to find work. They are mothers and fathers to an estimated 2 million children. And they are counting down to December 28.

So far, the economic recovery has left them behind. Congress must not simply do so as well. We must extend this vital insurance.

IMMIGRATION

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this Thanksgiving as our family gathered joyfully for dinner, we thought not only of our happiness, but of the many families that can be torn apart by our broken immigration system. We gave thought to those who were gathered at that very moment here on The National Mall going without food, fasting for justice. And they have been doing that now for weeks.

Thanksgiving is about the first immigrants in this land, this land of opportunity. But today, we find too many of our neighbors are denied opportunity because of their immigration status. They can’t board a plane. They can’t come out of the shadows. They don’t know when they go to work in the morning if they will find their family members there at night. This is not right, and the time to fix that is right now.

The only thing preventing a bipartisan response to the immigration problems we have in this country is the unwillingness of the Speaker to permit a bipartisan vote on reform legislation.

And to those who are not moved by their heart, they should be moved by their pocketbook because of the economic potential of permitting these individuals, two-thirds of which, in Mexican families in Texas without documents, have been here for at least a decade. Let them contribute to America.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NOVEMBER 22, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 22, 2013 at 10:52 a.m.:

Appointments:
United States Commission on Civil Rights.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1702

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SPACE LAUNCH LIABILITY INDEMNIFICATION EXTENSION ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3547) to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3547

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Space Launch Liability Indemnification Extension Act".

SEC. 2. INDEMNIFICATION EXTENSION.

Section 50915(f) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking "December 31, 2013" and inserting "December 31, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3547, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill we consider today provides stability for our Nation's commercial launch providers so that they can remain competitive in the international market.

The bill extends the existing system, which requires commercial launch pro-

viders to purchase insurance up to the maximum probable loss. It then provides that the government will compensate up to \$1.5 billion, plus inflation, and any amount above that is the responsibility of the original commercial launch provider.

Two weeks ago, the Space Subcommittee heard testimony from industry experts about the need to extend the Commercial Space Launch Act's risk-sharing system. Two of the witnesses who testified deal with this law on a regular basis.

Mr. Stuart Witt, president of the Mojave Air and Space Port, is developing new launch systems and technologies that could revolutionize space by making it more accessible. He told the subcommittee that this law allows companies to continue to innovate and grow.

Another witness, Ms. Patricia Cooper, president of the Satellite Industry Association, represents companies that add billions of dollars to the U.S. economy as a result of the current risk-sharing system. Ms. Cooper testified that the system's continuation is "absolutely essential" and that her association "strongly recommends that it be renewed before it expires."

The committee also recently received a letter signed by DigitalGlobe, Boeing, Virgin Galactic, Lockheed Martin, American Pacific Corporation, Aerojet Rocketdyne, ATK, Ball, Honeywell, AMT II, and Orbital Sciences which advocated the renewal of the risk-sharing system in order to keep the U.S. competitive in the global market.

Last year, the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee held a separate hearing on indemnification and heard from the Federal Aviation Administration, the Government Accountability Office, DigitalGlobe, and the Aerospace Industries Association. At this hearing, Frank Slazer, with the Aerospace Industries Association, summed up his trade association's position by stating:

Many foreign launch providers competing against U.S. companies already benefit from generous indemnification rules . . . We cannot afford to drive away highly skilled technical jobs to foreign countries, where the regulatory frameworks provide better critical risk management tools. Lastly, a non-renewal could impede new U.S. entrants to the commercial launch market, discourage future space launch innovation and entrepreneurial investment. Without a level playing field for competition, new U.S. entrants could find it highly undesirable to begin their business ventures in the United States.

The FAA launch indemnification authority has been in place for over 20 years, and the American commercial space industry has benefited significantly over this time. Thankfully, the provision has never been triggered by a serious accident, but the stability it provides allows the U.S. to remain competitive in the global market and to push the boundaries of space technology.

The bill before us would extend indemnification for 1 more year with the hope that we can address a longer-term legislative solution. I would have pre-

ferred a longer extension. For instance, the NASA Authorization Act that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee passed last summer extended indemnification for 5 years, but we now have a bipartisan bill before us that provides stability to our commercial space industry by protecting companies against third-party liability claims.

This provision expires on December 31, so time is short. This bill buys us time to work on a long-term extension as part of the larger Commercial Space Launch Act renewal that we will take up next year. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 3547, a bill to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014.

First established by Congress as part of the Commercial Space Launch Act Amendments of 1988, the commercial space transportation risk-sharing liability and insurance regime has been extended seven times since its original enactment. The current extension expires on December 31 of this year, so it is important for Congress to act now so that there is sufficient time for this legislation to make its way to the President's desk before the current authority expires.

The liability and insurance regime that would be extended by this legislation is three-tiered.

In the first tier, licensed commercial launch providers are required to purchase third-party liability insurance to compensate for possible losses from third-party claims by the uninvolved public up to the maximum probable loss level determined by the Federal Aviation Administration as part of its licensing process, or a maximum level of \$500 million.

In the second tier, for claims above those maximum probable losses, the U.S. Government may pay successful liability claims up to \$1.5 billion in 1989 dollars, or about \$2.8 billion in today's dollars, subject to funds being appropriated by Congress for that purpose.

In the third tier, for successful claims above the aforementioned \$2.8 billion, the licensee assumes responsibility for payment.

It should be noted that the U.S. Government has not appropriated a single dollar to pay for the third-party claims in the two-decade history of this program.

The existence of the liability risk-sharing regime has helped enable the development and the sustainment of a commercial space launch industry in the United States, including the emergence of several new companies in recent years. In addition, the regime has

allowed U.S. companies to remain competitive with their international counterparts, almost all of whose governments provide similar or more generous risk-sharing liability regimes to that of the U.S.

The commercial space transportation liability and insurance regime has worked. It has not cost the American taxpayer a single dollar in claims, and it has strengthened U.S. competitiveness in commercial space launch—and this is not a blank check since any potential payments for claims would be subject to prior congressional appropriation.

The bill before us today extends the liability risk-sharing regime for a period of 1 year. While that is less than some in the industry would like, I believe it is an appropriate length. That is because much has changed since the risk-sharing liability and indemnification regime was established in 1988 and because the commercial space launch industry continues to evolve over time.

Commercial providers are delivering spacecraft to orbit and commercial resupply services to the international space station, and companies are working hard toward providing commercial human spaceflight. I am excited about the entrepreneurial spirit many of these new companies exhibit, and I want them to succeed, but I also want to ensure that the Nation's commercial space transportation legislation reflects the changing industry and protects the American public.

The commercial space industry has been evolving in ways that were not envisioned when the risk regime was first established, and we need to evaluate if changes are needed to this decades-old law. The 1-year extension provides the Congress with the time to conduct necessary hearings, perform our due diligence, and enable the enactment of a comprehensive update to existing commercial space legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. LAMAR SMITH; the chairman of the Space Subcommittee, STEVE PALAZZO; and the subcommittee's ranking member, DONNA EDWARDS, for cosponsoring this bill with me. This is a good, bipartisan bill, and I urge Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), who is the vice chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3547, the Space Launch Liability Indemnification Extension Act.

I want to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for again demonstrating the type of bipartisan support that we have for legitimate science and space projects here in the United States Congress.

People say we can't work together. We can keep our eyes on the stars and

on the positive things, and we are working together. This piece of legislation proves just that. It wasn't so long ago that there were a lot of people who were skeptical about the commercial space industry, and it is heartening to see that we now have gathered together to make sure that our American entrepreneurs—our space entrepreneurs—are successful and that they do, indeed, launch not only rockets into space but launch a whole new industry, providing great jobs for the American people into space and, thus, benefiting all of us. That is why it is a bipartisan effort that we are talking about today.

Space launch liability indemnification is important for the American launch industry, which is, once again, as I said, regaining a global market share to maintain the global market expectations. It is also important to maintain standards that have been long expected of American companies. I fully support a deeper look into this issue, which this legislation provides, because I know that our indemnification structure is not just right for industry—it is right for the American people.

□ 1715

It is important to note that indemnification is not a one-way street with the government just protecting industry. The original policy back in 1988 was designed to protect the government as well as industry. When companies buy the insurance required by law, they protect the Federal Government against damages and against damage claims up to the maximum probable loss.

I would also note that the requirement for commercial launch providers to purchase insurance and protect the Federal Government against its liability never expires. We should permanently extend the space launch liability indemnification. I look forward to working with the chairmen and ranking members to accomplish just that as we go into next year.

I again rise in strong support and thank my colleagues for joining me in this effort to make sure we launch this whole new industry for America.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3547, the Space Launch Liability Indemnification Extension Act.

As a proud member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I am encouraged to hear about the exciting and innovative ways that the commercial space industry is pushing the bounds of space exploration. The legislation on the floor today helps to ensure that the industry will flourish and continue to create new, high-tech jobs.

In southern California, the Hawthorne-based SpaceX company employs

nearly 4,000 workers and has cemented itself as one of the premier commercial space enterprises by developing several launch vehicles and reusable spacecraft. In 2012, SpaceX successfully delivered cargo to the international space station using its Dragon capsule.

The Mojave Space Port is another bright light in the commercial space industry. At Mojave, more than 70 companies are working on highly advanced aerospace design and flight test research. Just 2 months ago, the Sierra Nevada Corporation completed its first free-flight test of the Dream Chaser, a winged spacecraft that could one day take astronauts to the international space station.

But as commercial space companies such as SpaceX, Sierra Nevada, Virgin Galactic, and others continue to test new technologies, it is important for the Federal Government to help alleviate some of the risk involved in undertaking such projects. By providing third-party indemnification, these companies can continue their work without risking their entire assets. In fact, Russia, China, France, and Japan all offer liability protections that exceed the United States' standard. Without this important protection, some companies could be forced to exit the market, costing the United States hundreds, if not thousands, of high-tech jobs. We cannot allow that to happen.

I am proud to support this legislation so that American commercial space companies can continue to grow and expand the possibilities of what mankind can achieve. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have no other speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I probably will not use all of the 5 minutes, but I wanted to be here today, Mr. Speaker, to support H.R. 3547, the Space Launch Liability Indemnification Extension Act, of which I am an original cosponsor.

I want to thank both our chairmen—the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. PALAZZO, and Chairman SMITH—and, of course, our ranking Democrat on the committee, Ms. JOHNSON, because we would not have been able to get to this point if we hadn't been able collectively, across the aisle, to work on a 1-year extension that would be provided for in Commercial Space Launch Act Amendments of 1988 that established the government-private risk-sharing regime for third-party liability. Should a launch accident occur, the effects that involve the public and property on the ground in this indemnification provision would cover such losses.

It turns out that commercial space launch capacity in the industry is really at a critical point in our Nation's development of our space infrastructure. Both the Federal and commercial

customers rely on commercial space launch, the industry for safe, reliable, and effective service, and delivering payloads in orbit and providing related space transportation services.

Just recently, in September of this year, a commercial space launch provider successfully lofted a cargo capsule into space to carry supplies to the international space station. This is exactly what we have in mind when we talk about integrating our commercial launch capacity with what we do already at NASA in terms of our scientific endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, commercial space transportation services have really always been carried out in partnership with the United States Government through the use of Federal launch ranges and services, for example, and through the government risk-sharing regime for protecting the uninvolved public and property should an accident occur. So it seems quite fitting that we have reached this point today.

Unfortunately, the reason that we are only able to do a 1-year extension and can agree on that is because there are also some other things that we need to figure out for the future with respect to the involvement of the commercial industry. It is my hope that over the course of this 1 year we will use that time wisely here in the Congress to have the kind of oversight hearings that we need to bring in the FAA so that we can make sure that we are venturing in this direction in the right kind of way that really takes into consideration what we are doing in the 21st century.

New entrants are delivering spacecraft to orbit, commercial resupply services to the international space station, and companies are working toward providing commercial human spaceflight on both reusable suborbital vehicles and orbital human spaceflight systems.

In fact, although I have been, admittedly, a skeptic, I am excited about the potential of the industry and I want it to succeed. Just last year, in a hearing on launch indemnification before the committee's Space Subcommittee of which I am the ranking member, a senior official representing the Aerospace Industries Association characterized the continuation of U.S. space launch indemnification as providing "substantial upside potential to enable new markets, create jobs, and assure U.S. space technology leadership for the 21st century."

It is easy to see how that upside is both national and local in scope. The launch capability at nearby Wallace air facility on the eastern shore is becoming a critical link to resupplying the international space station.

Commercial space companies make investments in our economy and create jobs all across the country. Specifically, in my home State of Maryland, companies like Lockheed Martin, Orbital, and Northrop Grumman employ thousands of people in my district

alone creating high-tech jobs, high-skilled jobs in the local community. ATK is a leading aerospace provider and has its main headquarters right up in Beltsville, Maryland, not very far from here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ensure that our legislation and policies regarding commercial space transportation reflect the changing industry, changes and activities that may not have been contemplated when the liability indemnification regime was first established. This 1-year extension provides Congress the opportunity to consider any potential changes that might be needed to ensure the continued safety of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to join us today in supporting H.R. 3547.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time if the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) is prepared to yield back her time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I urge support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3547, the Space Launch Liability Indemnification Extension Act.

The United States space program has existed for over half a century and my commitment to providing NASA with the resources to carry the agency forward with its ambitious agenda of research, exploration, and discovery is unwavering.

In June 2012, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and NASA signed an agreement to coordinate standards for commercial space travel of government and non-government astronauts to and from low-Earth orbit and the International Space Station (ISS).

The FAA regulates and licenses all U.S. private companies and individuals seeking to engage in commercial space transportation. The FAA's Office of Commercial Space Transportation has licensed 207 successful launches, including two non-orbital commercial human space flights in 2004 and the recent first launch to the ISS and re-entry of a non-manned commercial spacecraft. For details on FAA commercial space transportation responsibilities, visit:

The two agencies agreed to join efforts to expand commercial and non-commercial space exploration by creating a framework for the U.S. space industry. The two agencies will be able to avoid conflict regarding requirements and standards for the purpose of advancing both public and crew safety.

This is an important collaboration that for the private sector is a good sign for companies seeking to reap commercial benefits that may be found in spaceflight investments.

NASA continues to push the boundaries of what is possible, keeping our Nation on the forefront of innovation and exploration. It is the responsibility of this Congress to ensure that the future of NASA is one of continued progress.

Space exploration remains a part of our national destiny. It inspires our children to look to the stars and dream of what they too, one

day, may achieve. Space exploration allows us to push the bounds of our scientific knowledge, as we carry out research projects not possible within the constraints of the planet Earth.

Because of the ground breaking work of NASA commercial applications for space, such as commercial satellites have become critical for mobile communication services.

Smartphones rely upon commercial satellite to function, which makes possible the communication revolution we are witnessing today.

Today, the ground work done to advance knowledge regarding space exploration has reached a point where private sector companies are exploring ways to commercialize space exploration.

For example, Companies like Virgin now operates Virgin Galactic has completed its second test flight for commercialization of space travel and is selling passenger tickets for its first flight. However, we must still fully fund NASA and U.S. public space exploration.

A critical milestone for space exploration will be successful commercial efforts to provide services or develop new methods of manufacturing that are space based or the exploration of neighboring bodies for discovery of rare earth minerals or discovery of more abundant sources of elements or resources that can aid human development.

H.R. 3547, the Space Launch Liability Indemnification Extension Act provides a means of making it possible for private companies to pursue commercial space projects.

I ask my colleagues to support this effort to make the next step in human development of space a successful one by joining me in voting in support of H.R. 3547, the Space Launch Liability Indemnification Extension Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3547.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMUNITY FIRE SAFETY ACT OF 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3588) to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to exempt fire hydrants from the prohibition on the use of lead pipes, fittings, fixtures, solder, and flux.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3588

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Community Fire Safety Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. EXEMPTING FIRE HYDRANTS FROM PROHIBITION ON USE OF LEAD.

Section 1417(a)(4)(B) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by inserting "fire hydrants," after "shower valves,".

SEC. 3. EVALUATION OF SOURCES OF LEAD IN WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS AND ALTERNATE ROUTING SYSTEMS.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(1) consult with and seek the advice of the National Drinking Water Advisory Council on potential changes to the regulations pertaining to lead under the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(2) request the Council to consider sources of lead throughout drinking water distribution systems, including through components used to reroute drinking water during distribution system repairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, many Members think that the suspension calendar is reserved for unimportant legislation. That is not the case today. It is reserved for bills that need no amendments and on which more than two-thirds of the House agrees. The Community Fire Safety Act of 2013 meets those two tests.

Sometimes when we budget our time, we ask ourselves, what should I work on first, the urgent or the important? H.R. 3588 is both urgent and important. It corrects a problem that first surfaced in October of this year, but which impacts all water utilities and firefighting units in the United States effective next month.

Water utilities have made it clear that they have two choices come January 4: fail to comply with Federal law, or leave gaps in critical fire hydrant service. No one should ever face that choice.

Here is the background. On January 4, 2011, the President signed into law the Reduction of Lead in Drinking Water Act. This law prohibits the manufacturing and installation of pipes, fittings, and fixtures that have lead content of greater than two-tenths of 1 percent, but it exempts specific items, including tub fillers and shower valves. There is also a general exemption for pipes, fittings, and fixtures where the water is not anticipated to be consumed.

The effective date of the law is January 4, 2014, the beginning of next month. I am told that when Congress wrote this law in 2010 and the President signed it in 2011, the issue of fire hydrants never entered the conversa-

tion—nor did the EPA suggest that fire hydrants were covered, at least not until October of this year, 10 short weeks before the law takes effect.

On October 22, the EPA announced that because fire hydrants are occasionally, but rarely, used in the stream of human water consumption, they are not exempt under the act. This means any hydrant manufactured or installed 33 days from now must have a lead content that meets the statutory standard.

The EPA's conclusion was based on a technical reading of the statute. Because the rule's announcement takes effect in early January, the solution is this brief but important legislation.

The worry for water utilities and firefighters is that hydrants can break without warning, often as a result of vehicular accidents. Winter is a busy time for replacing hydrants due, in part, to freezing road conditions. But neither water utilities nor firefighters can tolerate hydrants that are not certified to meet strict performance parameters. Hydrants must never get stuck closed and should never leak.

Why do hydrants contain tiny amounts of lead in the brass alloys in their valves and other parts? Because that alloy gives a cleaner fit that doesn't leak and doesn't get stuck. Confidence that a hydrant meets this standard is crucial.

Mr. Speaker, even though a couple of manufacturers claim to have developed hydrants that can meet today's lead-free standard, none of them claims independent verification of the lead-free standard, much less proof that the extreme low-lead hydrant will work for fire safety. If such hydrants are developed and later certified, communities will certainly always be free to choose them. But in the meantime, the 2010 law is unforgiving.

□ 1730

It does not allow exemptions for even the least frequent and briefest exposures to water that may pass through a hydrant. Communities that never allow any human consumption from a hydrant will be barred from installing hydrants that today are in stock and ready to meet emergency repairs.

The risk to human health from lead in water is from long-term exposure. That is why there is no scientific data showing health effects from people drinking water from hydrants. But there are documented times when firefighters have arrived on the emergency scene only to find the hydrant is out of service. This leads to tragedy we can and must avoid.

If shower valves and tub fillers should be exempt—and they are—let's exempt hydrants so there are no gaps in fire safety. I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 3588.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be here with my colleague from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) in support of H.R. 3588.

As we heard, 3 years ago, Congress passed important legislation to reduce lead in drinking water supplies by eliminating a very significant remaining source of lead—our water delivery infrastructure. The Reduction of Lead in Drinking Water Act amended the Safe Drinking Water Act to address the high levels of lead documented in the drinking water in many communities.

Lead is a very dangerous contaminant, and it is especially dangerous to our children. It is retained in their bodies and leads to a host of chronic problems. We need to remove lead from our drinking water, but we do not need to regulate fire hydrants to achieve this worthy and important goal.

Fire hydrants are rarely used to provide drinking water, and those rare occasions are during emergencies—for instance, the break of a water main. And, when these rare events occur, flushing the hydrant is sufficient to ensure that lead and other contaminants are not conveyed in the water.

As sometimes happens, Mr. Speaker, laws have unintended consequences. When Congress passed the amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act 3 years ago, I doubt anyone intended to have EPA regulate fire hydrants.

EPA hosted a webinar on this issue recently. The agency consulted stakeholders from the hydrant manufacturing industry, municipalities from across our country, State and city regulatory agencies, and water supply companies. These sources provided the Agency with information to demonstrate that regulating hydrants would be expensive to implement, and it would deliver virtually no additional public health benefits.

Closer to home, I heard from two municipalities in my district, Latham and Colonie, both in Albany County. Their local leaders were very concerned about the expense of replacing their inventory of fire hydrants and about problems that could arise if they were unable to service and replace hydrants in a timely manner.

As we all know, fire hydrants are a vital part of the safety infrastructure of every community, large or small, across this great country. I am told the average cost is as high as \$2,000 per hydrant, if not more. Most communities keep a reserve inventory so hydrants can be replaced as needed. Without this fix, communities across the country would be spending millions to replace inventories of working hydrants.

Not only would communities have to replace their inventory of hydrants, but there is a real question about the availability of lead-free alternatives. The supply of lead-free hydrants is still small, and some newer designs have yet to be tested and certified fully.

Well, we certainly do not need to impose unnecessary costs on our communities across this country. We can fix this problem, and we are moving forward with a sound and effective solution today.

H.R. 3588 adds fire hydrants to the list of plumbing fixtures and other

components of water infrastructure that are exempted from the requirements to reduce lead. H.R. 3588 is a simple, bipartisan bill that provides a straightforward correction to the law. It will save our communities money and time, two very important commodities.

In addition, the bill contains a provision requiring the EPA Administrator to consult with the Drinking Water Advisory Council on options for reducing lead in our drinking water in a cost-effective manner. Hopefully, this dialogue will provide more cost-effective options for achieving a worthy goal: cleaner, safer drinking water.

Again, I want to commend our colleague, Representative JOHNSON, for his work on this legislation and thank him for working together with me to ensure that communities can concentrate on efforts that will bring true public health improvements to our citizens and avoid unnecessary expenses that achieve no real benefits.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members who wish to speak on this issue. If my good friend is prepared to summarize, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers here on our side.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio; I want to thank Chairman UPTON of the Energy and Commerce Committee and Ranking Member WAXMAN of the same committee for expediting this very important bill. Again, I urge all of our colleagues to support this worthy legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I too want to say thanks to my good friend and colleague, Mr. TONKO, for his support of this legislation. It may seem trivial to some; but trust me, it is not trivial to the many communities who are sitting on stockpiles, literally millions of dollars worth of current hydrant technology that would have to be replaced as a result, and that money just going down the tubes. I, too, urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 3588.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3588.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Suspending the rules and passing:

H.R. 3547, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3588, by the yeas and nays; and Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SPACE LAUNCH LIABILITY INDEMNIFICATION EXTENSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3547) to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 5, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 612]

YEAS—376

Aderholt
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clever

Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette

Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)

King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley

Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schroeder
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

Young (IN)

Conyers
Cook
Cooper

Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee

Pallone
Paulsen
Payne

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

NAYS—5

Amash
Gohmert

Jones
Massie

Sanford

Cottow
Courtney

Crawford
Crenshaw

Pearce
Pelosi

Visclosky
Wagner

Webster (FL)
Welch

Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—50

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Cramer
Culberson
DeLauro
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr

Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Hudson
Huffman
Kline
Lipinski
Lummis
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris
Rodgers

Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Radel
Ribble
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Sires
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman
Schultz

Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeBene
Dinham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebbeck
Loftgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo

Peterson
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Carter
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Cramer
Culberson
DeLauro
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr

NOT VOTING—47

Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Huffman
Kline
Lipinski
Lummis
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris
Rodgers
Miller (FL)

Miller, George
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Radel
Ribble
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Sires
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1902

Mr. OWENS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 612 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

COMMUNITY FIRE SAFETY ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3588) to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to exempt fire hydrants from the prohibition on the use of lead pipes, fittings, fixtures, solder, and flux on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 0, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 613]

YEAS—384

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black

Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps

Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chu
Clarke
Cohen
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly

Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt

Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo

Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 237, noes 126, answered “present” 1, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 614]

AYES—237

Aderholt Hastings (FL) Palazzo
 Amodei Hastings (WA) Payne
 Bachus Heck (WA) Pelosi
 Barletta Hensarling Perry
 Barr Higgins Petri
 Barrow (GA) Himes Pingree (ME)
 Barton Hinojosa Pocar
 Bass Holt Polis
 Beatty Horsford Pompeo
 Becerra Hoyer Posey
 Bera (CA) Huelskamp Price (NC)
 Bilirakis Huiizenga (MI) Quigley
 Blackburn Hultgren Rangel
 Blumenauer Hurt Rice (SC)
 Bonamici Issa Roby
 Boustany Jackson Lee Rogers (KY)
 Brady (TX) Jeffries Rogers (MI)
 Brooks (AL) Johnson (GA) Rohrabacher
 Brownley (CA) Johnson, Sam Rokita
 Buchanan Jones Ros-Lehtinen
 Bustos Kaptur Roskam
 Butterfield Keating Ross
 Calvert Kelly (IL) Rothfus
 Capito Kennedy Royce
 Capps Kildee Ruiz
 Cárdenas King (IA) Runyan
 Carney King (NY) Ruppersberger
 Carson (IN) Kingston Ryan (OH)
 Cassidy Kuster Ryan (WI)
 Chabot Labrador Salmon
 Clay LaMalfa Sánchez, Linda
 Cleaver Lamborn T.
 Cohen Langevin Scalise
 Collins (NY) Lankford Schiff
 Conyers Larsen (WA) Schneider
 Cook Latta Schock
 Cooper Loeb sack Schrader
 Crenshaw Lofgren Schweikert
 Cuellar Long Scott (VA)
 Cummings Lowenthal Scott, Austin
 Daines Lucas Scott, David
 Davis (CA) Lujan, Ben Ray Sensenbrenner
 Davis, Danny (NM) Serrano
 DeGette Lynch Sessions
 Delaney Marchant Shea-Porter
 DelBene Marchant Sherman
 Denham Marino Shimkus
 Dent Massie Shuster
 DesJarlais Matsui Simpson
 Deutch McAllister Sinema
 Diaz-Balart McCarthy (CA) Smith (NE)
 Dingell McClintock Smith (NJ)
 Doggett McCollum Smith (TX)
 Doyle McHenry Smith (WA)
 Duncan (SC) McIntyre Stutzman
 Duncan (TN) McKeon Takano
 Ellmers McKinley Thornberry
 Engel McNerney Tierney
 Farenthold Meadows Titus
 Fincher Meeks Tonko
 Fleischmann Meng Tsongas
 Fortenberry Messer Van Hollen
 Foster Mica Vargas
 Frankel (FL) Michaud Vela
 Franks (AZ) Miller (MI) Vela
 Frelinghuysen Miller, Gary Wagner
 Gabbard Moran Walorski
 Gallego Mullin Walz
 Gerlach Mulvaney Watt
 Gibbs Murphy (FL) Waxman
 Goodlatte Murphy (PA) Webster (FL)
 Gosar Nadler Welch
 Gowdy Napolitano Westmoreland
 Grayson Neugebauer Whitfield
 Grimm Noem Williams
 Guthrie Nolan Wilson (FL)
 Hahn Nunes Wilson (SC)
 Hall Nunnelee Womack
 Harper O'Rourke Woodall
 Harris Olson Young (IN)

NOES—126

Amash Chu Duckworth
 Andrews Clarke Duffy
 Barber Clyburn Edwards
 Benishek Coffman Esty
 Bentivolio Collins (GA) Fattah
 Bishop (NY) Conaway Fitzpatrick
 Brady (PA) Connolly Fleming
 Braley (IA) Costa Flores
 Brooks (IN) Cotton Forbes
 Bucshon Courtney Foss
 Burgess Crowley Fudge
 Capuano Davis, Rodney Garamendi
 Cartwright DeFazio Garcia
 Castor (FL) DeSantis Gardner

Garrett Levin
 Gibson Lewis
 Graves (GA) LoBlundo
 Green, Al Maffei
 Green, Gene Matheson
 Griffin (AR) McGovern
 Griffith (VA) Moore
 Hanabusa Neal
 Hanna Negrete McLeod
 Hartzler Nugent
 Heck (NV) Pallone
 Holding Paulsen
 Honda Pearce
 Hunter Peters (CA)
 Israel Peters (MI)
 Jenkins Peterson
 Johnson (OH) Pittenger
 Johnson, E. B. Poe (TX)
 Jordan Price (GA)
 Joyce Rahall
 Kelly (PA) Reed
 Kilmer Reichert
 Kind Renacci
 Kinzinger (IL) Richmond
 Lance Rigell
 Larson (CT) Roe (TN)
 Latham Rooney
 Lee (CA) Roybal-Allard

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—67

Bachmann Gingrey (GA) Miller (FL)
 Bishop (GA) Granger Miller, George
 Bishop (UT) Graves (MO) Owens
 Black Grijalva Pascrell
 Bridenstine Gutiérrez Pastor (AZ)
 Brown (GA) Herrera Beutler Perlmutter
 Brown (FL) Hudson Pitts
 Camp Huffman Radel
 Campbell Kirkpatrick Ribble
 Cantor Kline Rogers (AL)
 Carter Lipinski Rush
 Castro (TX) Luetkemeyer Sanchez, Loretta
 Chaffetz Lujan Grisham Sanford
 Cicilline (NM) Schwartz
 Coble Lummis Sires
 Cole Maloney, Carolyn Southerland
 Cramer Carolyn Speier
 Crawford Maloney, Sean Stewart
 Culberson McCarthy (NY) Thompson (CA)
 DeLauro McCaul Wasserman
 Ellison McDermott Schultz
 Enyart McMorris Wolf
 Eshoo Rodgers Yarmuth
 Farr Meehan

□ 1919

Ms. McCOLLUM changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to travel arrangements, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 612 through No. 614 on December 2, 2013.

If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 612—H.R. 3547, The Space Launch Liability Indemnification Extension Act, "aye"; rollcall vote No. 613—H.R. 3588, To amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to exempt fire hydrants from the prohibition on the use of lead pipes, fittings, fixtures, solder, and flux, "aye"; rollcall vote No. 614—Adoption of the Journal, "nay".

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mrs. MILLER, Michigan, Chairman
 Mr. PRICE, Georgia
 Mr. LATTA, Ohio

RECOGNIZING FAST FOR FAMILIES

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today I visited Fast for Families, a group of advocates who 21 days ago vowed to abstain from food to bring awareness to the need for a bipartisan remedy for our broken immigration system.

Support for the fasters is growing with groups joining across the country in solidarity. Like many others in the U.S., they want to find a solution for the immigrant families living in this great country that they call home. We can all agree that it is time to modernize our immigration laws. Fixing what is broken will not be an easy task, but it will bring benefits to our Nation, which can be strengthened and reinvigorated by those hardworking individuals.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reach out to one another, begin a conversation, and resolve this issue. We can work together to secure our borders and honor the rule of law while addressing the problems in our immigration system with solutions that reflect our American principles.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

RECOGNIZING FAST FOR FAMILIES AND WORLD AIDS DAY

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, understanding the rules of the House, nonetheless I would like to say how honored we all are that our special guests, led by Eliseo Medina, are here as part of the Fast for Families. I want to join the distinguished former chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, and say that I, too, visited the Fast for Families. I fast for immigration and wear the button.

I am so proud that our House of Representatives showed its respect to the strength of the message of our guests here today because immigration is about America. It is who we are by and large, a Nation of immigrants. It is the constant reinvigoration of our country. Every person who comes here with his or her hopes, dreams, and aspirations for a better future; optimism for the

future, the courage to come, to work hard, to play by the rules—that invigorates America. The tradition of family and community and the rest, every immigrant who comes with those values and those goals makes America more American.

I also rise, Mr. Speaker, to talk about a place where immigration and health come together, and I thank President Obama for lifting the travel ban on those infected with HIV. It had been my original intent to seek recognition to talk about World AIDS Day, which we observed yesterday, but I wanted to pay my respect to those who are fasting for immigration.

Our work on HIV-AIDS has been a product of bipartisan cooperation in this Congress over a long period of time. In the White House, though, first with President Clinton, we increased the bilateral programs to fight AIDS and we helped create, authorize, and fund the Global Fund. Then under the leadership of President Bush, we established PEPFAR and provided the necessary funding to ramp up the emergency response to the crisis. President Obama has strengthened those efforts and boosted our investment by launching the National HIV-AIDS Strategy.

In addition to that, President Obama announced that PEPFAR would not only reach its goal of providing treatment for 6 million people by 2013 but will exceed that target by providing 6.7 million people with lifesaving treatment. This is attributed to the leadership of President George W. Bush and to President Obama.

True today, President Obama went further and signed the PEPFAR and Global Fund reauthorization bill into law, and I am proud that President Obama has announced a U.S. commitment of \$1 for every \$2 provided by other donors up to \$5 billion through 2016. This marks a likely \$1 billion increase over previous years. That means more lives saved and quality of life increased.

Our work is far from finished. HIV and AIDS is a really resourceful disease, that virus, ever mutating. Just when you think we have it in our sights, it changes, and so we have to be resourceful to our approach to the HIV-AIDS virus because we will not allow HIV and AIDS to claim so many lives when we have within our means the science, the prevention, the care, the search for a cure to make a difference. One of the most exciting parts of it is that we will now be able to have an AIDS-free generation of transmittal from mother-to-child, which is quite remarkable, among other remarkable aspects of it.

This is an important issue about our values as a country, our concern for people in our community and globally across the world, which takes us back to the beautiful reception that our fasters for immigration received when they were here earlier.

As a mom and as a grandmother, I would encourage them not to fast very

much longer, but I want them to know that we all recognize their sacrifice, understand the need to pass comprehensive immigration reform, and hope that will happen soon.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH AT BRADFORD CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the University of Pittsburgh at Bradford, which is located in McKean County, Pennsylvania.

Fifty years ago, Pitt-Bradford was a few buildings with just about 300 students. Over the decades, the school has grown from a 2-year feeder campus to a distinguished and thriving 4-year university.

Today, Pitt-Bradford's campus is home to 1,600 students and about 10,000 alumni from across the entire country. The university offers 37 bachelor's degrees, five associate degrees, and more than 50 minors. For the last 9 consecutive years, Pitt-Bradford has been ranked by The Princeton Review as one of the best colleges in the Northeast.

Due to the university, local industries have greater access to scientific and technical expertise. Area residents have access to a growing number of jobs, and the region's economy has greatly benefited as a result.

I offer my praise to the university's founders and the generations of school administrators, teachers, and students who have worked to turn the small campus into a renowned institution of higher learning.

□ 1930

LIVE WELL SAN DIEGO

(Mr. PETERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the growing involvement of San Diego area schools and businesses in the Live Well San Diego initiative. Live Well San Diego engages the San Diego community from government, business, military, faith groups, and schools to improve the health, fitness, and safety of our residents.

Preventable chronic diseases contribute to over 50 percent of deaths in the region, and Live Well San Diego is working to find innovative ways to reduce their impact and lower national health care costs in the long term. Through involvement with schools in my district, Live Well San Diego is reducing childhood obesity through daily physical education and recess breaks.

Earlier this year, the San Diego North Chamber of Commerce joined with Live Well San Diego to educate

area business owners about creating workplaces that focus on health and wellness.

Clear Channel Communications has also partnered with Live Well San Diego to spread the word. Recently, the initiative launched a Web site, livewellsd.org, to give residents information to live healthier lives.

Live Well San Diego is an example of how collaborative public-private partnerships are working to improve public health. I am proud of the work that Live Well San Diego is doing for the people of San Diego County. Our residents are happier and healthier because of it.

THE OUTSTANDING SERVICE OF WESLEY ENHANCED LIVING

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125 years of outstanding service and community involvement of Wesley Enhanced Living, a Philadelphia, Bucks County, and Montgomery County faith-based institution providing wonderful service to my district.

For more than a century, the professional, dedicated staff at Wesley has provided a crucial service to seniors around the Delaware Valley. Following their guiding values of grace, honor, and integrity, Wesley has strived to serve the aging population and better their golden years.

Beyond the task of caring for its residents, the leadership at Wesley Enhanced Living has been open and forthcoming towards new and innovative ways to help seniors across the country. By working in unison with leaders in the field, we have been able to find better ways to represent the seniors in my district and serve the needs of those who care for them each day.

I wish the best for Wesley Enhanced Living, and I hope that their commitment to our community continues for another 125 years.

WORLD AIDS DAY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was World AIDS Day. And before I left my home district this morning, I gathered with longtime friends and fighters against the surge and the scourge of HIV/AIDS.

Although we have come a long way and made a great difference, 50,000 people are affected each year by HIV/AIDS. This is the 32nd year of the establishment or the announcement of the epidemic of HIV/AIDS, and today some 34 million-plus around the world live with HIV/AIDS. Every 9½ minutes, someone in this country is infected with AIDS.

So I stand here in salute of the Thomas Street Health Center and the

AIDS Foundation, one, because of the health care that the Thomas Street Health Center gives and to be able to thank them for the litany and devotional that they provided for us, and to the AIDS Foundation, of course, to thank them for letting people live with AIDS and to have the comfort of those who will stand with them.

I am also wearing another button today, and that is to salute those and to embrace those who are for the fast-growing families. We must have comprehensive immigration reform, and I stand with them to save lives, as well.

APPLAUDING STATE CHAMPION EDEN PRAIRIE EAGLES FOOTBALL TEAM

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Eden Prairie Eagles for winning this year's Minnesota High School Football Championship.

It was a three-peat, Mr. Speaker. With this weekend's victory, the Eagles solidified a State record ninth school championship and became the first large enrollment school to win three consecutive titles.

Going undefeated the entire season, the road to the State title was nothing short of excellence, and the Eagles' victory was earned through unwavering hard work.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this year's team exemplify what it means to be student athletes, and they have shown incredible determination, character, and teamwork. It is no wonder that nearly 20,000 Minnesotans came out to watch the championship game.

Congratulations to the entire team, including Coach and Eden Prairie High School Athletic Director Mike Grant. This year's success is a tribute to their high level of commitment, one that I am sure they will continue to display not only on the field, but in all aspects of their years to come.

WORLD AIDS DAY

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank our leader, NANCY PELOSI, for her dedication and unwavering support to fight AIDS since arriving at the United States Congress 25 years ago.

This morning, I had the honor of joining President Obama, Secretary Kerry, Secretary Sebelius, and many advocates at the White House to mark World AIDS Day. It was a time for remembering the friends and loved ones whom we have lost. It was a reminder of the extraordinary progress that we have made, but also a reminder that we cannot stop now.

In the United States Congress, few issues have transcended partisan grid-

lock like the fight against AIDS. I want to also salute Chairman ED ROYCE and our ranking member Eliot Engel for their unwavering commitment to keeping this a bipartisan issue. Thank you.

In the last 2 weeks alone, we have passed the HIV Organ Policy Equity Act and the PEPFAR Stewardship and Oversight Act, which President Obama signed into law this afternoon.

So many played a major role in the creation of PEPFAR and the Global Fund, and I am so proud of the leadership from the Congressional Black Caucus in supporting PEPFAR and the Minority AIDS Initiative and the National Strategy on HIV and AIDS.

Now is the time to recommit ourselves to an AIDS-free generation.

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE IN UKRAINE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Ukrainian Caucus here in the House, I rise today to condemn the violence currently igniting in Ukraine at the hands of Ukraine's top government officials. Their targets are peaceful protesters and dozens and dozens of journalists who have been harmed.

Shouldn't President Yanukovich and the Ukrainian Government be working hard to encourage and ensure a more open society rather than repressing their own citizenry? Shouldn't they be building a society in which Ukrainians can assemble and freely voice concerns regarding the future of their country?

Hundreds of thousands of demonstrators, some have estimated over a million people, have taken to the streets in Kiev this past week out of frustration at their government's abandonment of the European Union Association Agreement. As protests escalated through this weekend, journalists and demonstrators were met with a violent police crackdown. Many were brutally beaten and burned by tear gas.

For many years now, Ukrainians have called for and continue to desire a government and country that embraces democracy, liberty, and respects human rights. Those citizens in the streets and all Ukrainians deserve the opportunity to peacefully demonstrate. They should not fear government retaliation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that I continue to support the Ukrainian people's European aspirations and their demands for democratic reform. Let the people of Ukraine move forward and face west and east and north and south with no fear of reprisal.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, climate scientists like Dr. Rob Dunbar of

Stanford are warning us that if we continue down this path of inaction, global sea levels will rise, on the average, anywhere from 1 to 7 feet by the end of this century.

Let's just take a 4-foot rise in global sea level, for example. That would devastate coastal communities and jeopardize, in my State, hundreds of thousands of Californians' properties, causing billions of dollars' worth of damage. As someone who represents a coastal port, this rise in sea level will cause us tremendous amount of infrastructure needs.

It is our responsibility to take action now to help cut greenhouse emissions so that we can start to curb some of the deepest harm caused by rising sea levels. If we do not act, we are turning our back on every coastal community not only in California, but on this entire planet.

CONGRATULATING THE YERINGTON LIONS FOOTBALL TEAM

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Yerington Lions football team on their 42-19 win over Mountain View Christian for the Division III Nevada State title.

They were undefeated throughout the season, finishing 11-0. So this wasn't just one title game; it was a year of proving that they are really the best. And it is not just any State title for this school; this is the first State title since 1981. And they have the support of everyone in town. The whole community was out for the game, wearing their team colors of purple and white.

Interesting to note, on average, the Yerington Lions gave up less than 5.6 points per game, average. That is lower than Congress' approval rating. That is pretty impressive, don't you think?

Yerington is an important part of my 51,000-square-mile district. So I want to say congratulations to the students, congratulations to Coach Cody Neville, and congratulations to Yerington. You make Nevada proud.

THE METRO-NORTH RAILROAD DERAILMENT

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my district and very near to my home, there was a horrific derailment on the Metro-North Railroad, which cost the lives of four people and injured another 63. My heart goes out to the victims: the people who died, the people who were injured, and their families, as well.

The National Transportation Safety Board is investigating, and hopefully very soon we will know exactly what happened and have their recommendations, as well. Right now, all preliminary accounts say that the train was

going 83 miles an hour in a 70-mile-an-hour zone that was soon by a curve going down to what should have been a 30-mile-an-hour zone.

Again, I hope when the NTSB comes out with recommendations for safety on our rail in the United States, that the Congress will act accordingly and perhaps pass legislation to make our trains safer. In the meantime, again, my heart and our hearts go out to all the victims of this horrific tragedy.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to welcome to the House of Representatives five selfless individuals, courageous reformers who have made a tremendous sacrifice to raise awareness for the need of immigration reform. They are truly deserving not only of our applause, but also of our admiration.

After fasting for over 3 weeks, these committed reformers have successfully drawn attention to the pressing need to pass immigration reform. As Members of Congress, we cannot ignore the steadfast devotion of these advocates through further inaction.

Along with the majority of this country and the majority of the House of Representatives, these tremendous leaders know we need comprehensive immigration reform now. Unfortunately, the House leadership continues to irresponsibly block commonsense, bipartisan reform by refusing to let the full House vote.

Mr. Speaker, these leaders need more than applause. They deserve a vote, and they deserve it now.

THE DISTURBING AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I think there has been a lot of things going on in the world in the last few weeks and a lot here domestically, things that have not been going well on the administration's agenda. Those have been well documented and are not the reason that I rise tonight.

The purpose for my rising tonight is an issue that seems to want to distract from issues at home, and that is a very disturbing development with Iran and the administration's agreement that has been announced.

□ 1945

These are disturbing for many reasons. Tonight we rise, and I rise bipartisanship tonight, to talk about this because I want the people of Israel and I want the American people who are

great friends of Israel to be assured that there are plenty of Members of Congress committed to this alliance, I am proud to be one of them.

I also join with my friend from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), and I am excited to be a part of this and discuss for what will be a discussion of what we believe are the values that we share together.

I would go ahead and yield for a brief opening here before we get started, Mr. SCHNEIDER, as we go forward tonight.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you. It is an honor to be here with you to join you in this discussion. The world has watched anxiously as the P5+1 had a series of negotiations that culminated 2 weeks ago in an interim agreement.

As we join here tonight to talk about some of the issues in this agreement, what we will be looking for is to ensure that whatever happens, Iran is not allowed to achieve nuclear capability, and that our allies in the region, including Israel, Saudi Arabia, and others, are protected from the prospect of a nuclear Iran.

I yield back.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I agree, and I appreciate the gentleman so much.

I believe that it is certain in our foreign policy, as much as anything, America needs to speak from a position of strength that we have; that we should not deny our position of strength and our power to enforce what we believe are standards that need to be looked at across the world. Tonight I want to bring that attention to the floor of the House of Representatives and also to the Nation.

My dedication to the U.S.-Israel alliance brings me to the floor tonight with an urgent message for our President: Don't fall for Iran's public relations campaign. In the words of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu during his recent speech before the U.N., newly-elected Iranian President Hassan "Rouhani thinks he can have his yellowcake and eat it too."

President Rouhani is orchestrating an unprecedented charm offensive to reduce sanctions on his country. Over the last 5 months—this is amazing—his campaign has included tweeting "Happy Rosh Hashanah" to Jews across the globe celebrating their New Year, condemning the use of chemical weapons in Syria after the August 21 attacks, making diplomatic overtures to President Obama through personal letters.

Mr. President, tell Rouhani that mere words won't ultimately improve relations between the U.S. and Iran.

Most recently, two rounds of nuclear negotiations have occurred. A truly disturbing deal between the West and Iran materialized, which puts Israel in a very difficult position.

Much like negotiations with North Korea over its nuclear program, the U.S. is being duped. The deal allows Iran to maintain its nuclear program, while the U.S. sanctions are lifted for 6 months. This deal benefits no one but Iran. There are bipartisan measures

currently in the House and Senate to maintain sanctions and to continue to hold Iran accountable for its actions.

Mr. President, I ask you carefully review President Rouhani's record before moving further with more sanctions relief.

To really understand President Rouhani's intentions, let's look beyond his words to his actions.

On September 19, an op-ed by President Rouhani was published in *The Washington Post*. In the piece, Rouhani spoke against glorifying "brute force" and in favor of ending "unhealthy rivalries" that drive nations apart.

Forty-eight hours later, President Rouhani presided over the Iranian military parade showcasing over 30 missiles, all with the capability of striking Israel. During his speech, he said, "In the past 200 years, Iran has never attacked another country."

It gets better. Of course Iran doesn't have to attack because its proxy, Hezbollah, carries out its foreign policy. Hezbollah has continuously attacked Israel over the decades, and is instrumental in fighting the National Coalition of Syrian Revolution and Opposition Forces. The NCSRO is a rebel group which the U.S. recognizes as the legitimate representative of the Syrian people.

Let us not forget Iran's intrusion on U.S. soil. The Iranian hostage crisis of 1979 began with an attack on and subsequent occupation of the U.S. Embassy. Fifty-two Americans were held hostage for 444 days. The attack had the support of Iran's then-leader Ayatollah Khomeini. The attack was a clear violation of international diplomatic protocol.

President Rouhani has made several claims that Iran's nuclear program is for peaceful purposes. He says Iran's only desire is to diversify its energy production capability.

Yet, Iran has not only refused to reverse course on enriching uranium but has 1,000 new generation centrifuges that enrich uranium faster and are more durable than previous versions.

As we say down in Georgia, a slap on the jaw and a kiss on the cheek don't send the same message.

Recently, freshman members of the Foreign Affairs Committee sent a bipartisan letter to President Obama telling him to be vigilant in his diplomatic actions with Rouhani.

Any negotiation with the Iranian regime should only come after Iran has stopped enriching uranium and neutralizes the quantity it currently possesses. Congress has let its will be known with the passage of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act this summer in the House.

Congress and the American people do not trust the Iranian regime. The White House needs to sign the latest set of sanctions. These sanctions go further than previous ones by targeting the profiteering of black market goods. Sanctions target regime members who are guilty of human rights violations.

Congress is sending the message that not only do we highly discourage the development of nuclear weapons by the regime but detest how select citizens are subject to torture and restrictions on speech and political persecution. It is amazing what is going on right now.

The President needs to realize that the Middle East is not a chessboard, and we shouldn't play games with Iran. This is a time to stand up and be decisive. We must stand with Israel and other rational actors in the region and not capitulate on the development of a nuclear Iran.

With that, I want to yield to my friend as we share back and forth tonight on different aspects as we go forward.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you. I want to again thank Representative COLLINS for holding this important conversation tonight to talk about the dangers and long-term implications of a nuclear deal with Iran.

I think it is both timely and necessary that Congress continue this conversation and push hard to convince the Senate that further action is required to help prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Personally, I remain most skeptical that the Iranian regime has the ability or willingness to live up to the tenets and the terms of the Geneva agreement reached with the P5+1.

We have worked diligently over the years, over a decade, to maintain a robust sanctions regime that brought Iran to the negotiating table, but it was not to come to the table that the sanctions were put in place. These sanctions were put in place to ensure or achieve the end of Iran's nuclear program; to ensure that Iran is not a nuclear-capable country.

In July, as was mentioned, this body passed, by a vote of 400-20, the most sweeping sanctions to date in order to address the ongoing threat of a nuclear Iran. That legislation must be taken up in the Senate to hold Iran accountable, to ensure that Iran fully understands the implications of not completing a deal in 6 months that will eliminate its nuclear threat.

However, there are several points about the deal reached with Iran that are particularly worrisome. First, this interim agreement cannot be allowed to become the permanent agreement. The so-called joint plan of action is fraught with dangers, including allowing Iran to continue enrichment at the 5 percent level; allowing Iran to continue construction at the Iraq plutonium reactor, which has no purpose other than for military uses; allowing the ongoing enhancement of Iran's technical capabilities.

This agreement does not address Iran's ongoing program, its long-term activities. It doesn't require Iran to fully disclose all of its activities. This agreement does not address any covert sites which are not yet discovered or disclosed by Iran.

This deal, as I said, is fraught with dangers, and our purpose in Congress

and the United States and with our allies must be to try to navigate the joint plan of action to a permanent agreement that will ultimately freeze Iran's activities, roll them back, and require Iran to dismantle Natanz, Fordow, Arak and other facilities and, ultimately, and most importantly, permanently block and permanently close any path Iran has to a nuclear capability.

That includes no enrichment, no plutonium reactor, full transparency, full disclosure, unlimited and unfettered inspections.

With that, I will yield back to Mr. COLLINS.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate my colleague. You know, you brought up a great point there, and I want to continue to go into the history here because I don't want individuals who may be watching tonight or watching this later to simply look at this in a vacuum as saying that we are just disagreeing with the policy, and there was a diplomatic outreach that was given and we are not giving it an opportunity.

I think, from where I am from and I know you are as well, the past is prologue to what happens now, and I think what we have got to understand is the regime has not inherently changed. The regime in Iran still has just core issues with the West and especially with Israel.

I think you hit it perfectly and, before I continue, you brought it up again. The idea of these negotiations were not to find a placated middle. The desire is to find an end to the Iranian nuclear regime because we just don't trust them, and I think that's the inherent problem.

Let's look at it here from a perspective. President Rouhani was recently afforded a great opportunity to show a stark contrast between himself and the former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Mr. Rouhani was asked whether he believed the Holocaust was a myth. Rouhani answered: I am not a historian, I am a politician.

Netanyahu responded: It doesn't take a historian to recognize the existence of the Holocaust; it just requires being a human being.

Rouhani is captive to the religious zealots in his country and the policies of the Supreme Ruler Ayatollah Khomeini. Rouhani is so beholden to the regime's ideology that when the White House offered the opportunity for the newly-elected Iranian President to shake hands with our President, Rouhani's staff declined because of the fear of how it would be perceived in Iran.

Now, think about that a second. If a handshake can be turned into political gangrene for the Iranian President, how can we believe that any of Iran's diplomatic overtures will result in any real change?

I don't want the U.S. to go down the same path with Iran that it did with North Korea. In 2005, it was then seen

as a landmark deal. North Korea agreed to abandon its nuclear weapons program in return for economic security and energy benefits. Twelve months later North Korea tested its first nuclear weapon.

Let's not forget the immortal precept: Fool me once; let's not be fooled twice.

I would like to take time to highlight a few points from Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's speech before the U.N. This speech occurred nearly a week after Rouhani spoke before the international body.

But before doing so, I want to yield back to my friend from Illinois as well, and just as we continue this conversation, again, history matters and what has gone on in the past, I believe, is very crucial into understanding why many of us on the Hill, bipartisanly, do not trust the Iranian regime.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you. I think it is critical to emphasize the bipartisan aspect of the support in Congress for a strong sanctioned regime, and the security and protection of our allies, in particular, Israel.

As my colleague mentioned, in October, I, with LUKE MESSER, authored a letter to the President calling on him to push forward with sanctions. There were 78 members of the freshman class who signed on to that letter, Republican and Democrat, shoulder to shoulder, standing together, saying we must be strong.

Again, the interim agreement cannot move to anything near what is a permanent agreement. More importantly, it cannot lead to the collapse of the sanctions regime. We have worked too hard and come too far to let that happen.

In my opinion, I think we need to ensure that the architecture of the sanctions are reinforced, are broadened, are deepened and hardened, so that 6 months from now, if Iran fails to live to up to its commitment and the consequences are sufficiently severe, Iran understands that the likelihood of further action, all actions on the table, including a credible military threat, remain, so that ultimately Iran understands this is the moment, this is the time to abandon their nuclear aspirations.

This is why the sanctions are put in place. This is why it is critical for the Senate to pass the bill we passed in July and make sure Iran understands that not adhering to the agreement, not abandoning its nuclear program, will have dire consequences in 6 months. With that, I yield back.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman. Again, it is a matter of now. This has been going on for a while. This has not built up over the last couple of weeks that we discovered this problem. This has been a problem with Iran for, you know, going on years now that they have been building this program and really bunkering this program now, which I think your call for

transparency really highlights the need that—it is amazing now that all of a sudden they want to be open, but, yet, they only want to be open in a way that they control. But they do want the money.

□ 2000

I mean, I think it goes back to—we can sort of go back here to a quote from an American film, “Show me the money.” When you show me the money, you show me Iran’s intentions at this point. Because they want the money that has been held up by the sanctions. Why? Because the sanctions have worked. This administration needs to understand: the sanctions have worked. They have worked in a way that we have not seen before. It is not time to abandon those.

But as I mentioned just a few minutes ago, I wanted to take some time to highlight a few points from Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu’s speech. And if you haven’t had a chance to hear it—I know my colleague has—many times, we can talk about problems but we don’t offer solutions. And I think what he did is to not only highlight the problems with this administration and Iran, but also to engage in solutions as well. So I want to look at it for just a moment.

Netanyahu started his speech discussing the rich history that the Jewish and Persian nations share. For those who remember—in my case, from Sunday school class—over 2,000 years ago, the Babylonian Empire released the captive Jews to develop a homeland of their own. This historic friendship lasted until a radical regime came into power in Iran in 1979.

Netanyahu quickly pointed out how unlikely it is that Rouhani is truly a moderate. Rouhani was one of six candidates selected by the regime to run for office. That is six out of 700 candidates who desired to run. I think there is a little bit of picking going on here.

Rouhani led the Iranian version of the CIA and the NSA. During his time leading Iran’s Supreme National Security Council, 85 people were murdered at a Jewish community center in Argentina by Iranian henchmen. Iran has its fingerprints on the bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia that killed 19 American soldiers. Rouhani was the chief nuclear negotiator between 2003 and 2005.

This “moderate” Iranian developed a strategy encouraging diplomatic engagement but never changed its approach to increasing its nuclear proliferation abilities. Netanyahu cites a book Rouhani wrote in 2011 in which he wrote:

While we were talking to the Europeans in Tehran, we were installing equipment in Isfahan.

Isn’t that a telling thought right there?

Rouhani touts his negotiation skills by saying:

By creating a calm environment, we were able to complete the work in Isfahan.

Isfahan is a facility where the uranium ore called yellowcake is converted into an enrichable form. Since 2002, Iran has built two secret facilities to further its nuclear ambitions. Several years later, it was caught building a uranium enrichment station underground.

If Iran is only seeking peaceful nuclear energy, why is it building structures in a clandestine way? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the obvious answer there is clear.

Netanyahu also asked why Iran is trying to develop intercontinental ballistic missiles if not to further its nuclear ambitions. ICBMs are purposefully designed to be transportation vehicles for a nuclear weapon. As Netanyahu pointed out:

You don’t build ICBMs to carry TNT thousands of miles away.

The Prime Minister is clearly troubled in light of the U.S.’ history with North Korea.

Just like North Korea before it, Iran professes to seemingly peaceful intentions. It talks the talk of nonproliferation while seeking to ease sanctions and buy more time for its nuclear program.

He understands that America has been at a similar negotiating table and blinked. Instead of offering mere rhetoric or hollow gestures, as the Iranian President has done, Netanyahu offers a solution. He lays out steps the Iranian regime can make to show a willingness to negotiate and possibly have sanctions lifted.

Netanyahu proposes four steps for Iran, some that we need to look at as well:

Number one, ending all uranium enrichment;

Number two, removing its inventory of enriched uranium, similar to Syria’s handing over of its chemical weapons;

Number three, dismantling its infrastructure for nuclear breakout capability; and

Number four, stopping all work at the heavy water reactor in Iraq aimed at the production of plutonium.

These steps would cease Iran’s nuclear weapons program and eliminate its ability to conduct a nuclear strike.

Netanyahu does not just leave the ball, though, in Iran’s court, but asks the international community for assistance to ensure Iran’s compliance. He laid out a three-point strategy:

First, keep up the sanctions. If Iran advances its nuclear weapons program during negotiations, strengthen the sanctions. That is sort of the way it works. I know, you know, when I need something and I get out of line, you get pulled back in. You don’t get more freedom just by saying you are going to do something more. I know your children and my children, alike, in dealing with that, as you look ahead, there are more restrictions if you don’t do something right. That is a great first step;

Second, don’t agree to a partial deal. A partial deal would lift sanctions that have taken years to put in place in ex-

change for cosmetic concessions that will take only weeks for Iran to reverse;

Third, lift the sanctions only when Iran fully dismantles its nuclear program.

Netanyahu concludes his speech in a somewhat conciliatory tone. He said:

I am prepared to make a historic compromise for genuine and enduring peace, but I will never compromise on the security of my people and of my country, the one and only Jewish State.

Considering Israel’s hostile neighbors, I understand the Prime Minister’s vigilant tone. The U.S. has strongly supported Israel’s resolve in the past, and I hope this administration will not relent. Israel has the most to lose if Iran gets a bomb, and that is something we can’t ever forget.

With that, I yield back to my friend.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you again.

And you hit on a crucial point. For Israel, a nuclear Iran is an existential threat. It is life and death at the front lines. But also as you touched on, Israel has no greater a friend than the United States, and that relationship is a strategic relationship for both parties. We have no better ally. Israel is the only stable democratic country in the region. Israel is reliable. Israel is our friend, and we will always remember that.

I think it is also important to understand the breadth and scope of the Iranian program. You touched on that Iran is seeking to control the nuclear fuel cycle, from mining to yellowcake to enrichment to, ultimately, weapons grade. And that is a program that has spread throughout the country, from Isfahan to Natanz and Fordow and, ultimately, in the weaponization area at Parchin.

The second piece is weaponization. It is one thing to control the fuel cycle; it is another thing to turn that into a nuclear weapon. Iran is working aggressively to do that, and this deal does not address their weaponization programs.

And finally, once you control the fuel cycle, once you are able to have a weapon, it is delivery. And Iran, with their intercontinental ballistic missiles, ICBMs, is working to develop a capability to deliver such a weapon of mass destruction not just in this region but throughout the world.

Iran, for Israel, is an existential threat. But Iran, for the region, and Iran, for the world, is as extreme a threat as it is for Israel. We must prevent a nuclear Iran not just because Israel is our ally, but because a nuclear Iran is a threat to the whole region—a threat to nuclear destabilization, a nuclear arms race among other countries in the region—and that is what we are focused on. That is why it is so critical at this moment, as Iran is months away from the capability of having a nuclear weapon, we focus aggressively on closing the pathways—freezing, reversing, dismantling, and, ultimately, permanently blocking any pathway Iran has for a nuclear weapon.

With that, I yield back to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

One of the things that amazes me in what you just said is that we are so close and are getting closer every day for their capability to be, for the lack of a better term, perfected. They have been working at it. They have been hiding. They have been doing those things. And now to come at this last moment and get ready to give an infusion of cash, which is what they are going to be getting, to the tune of billions of dollars and to continue to allow the enrichment process is just really disturbing here.

I am not seeing, as I said earlier, the end game except that, from my perspective, there was the old philosophy. There was the old foreign policy of one of my party's heroes, one that I believe served this country well, and it was Ronald Reagan when he said that the foreign policy was, if we win, you lose. And I think, at this point, what is concerning me is that in this deal, if we lose, they win, and rest of the world is put in jeopardy.

And you made a great statement. Not only is Iran an existential threat to Israel, but as I often hear, well, why do we worry about Iran? That is another country. Why do we need to get involved? Because it is a direct and immediate threat to the U.S. as well.

We have troops within missile range. We have troops that are in international waters that could be literally affected by the military force in Iran, and I think those are issues that we have got to address as we move forward.

It is not something that we can just put in this little corner. Iran, in some ways, is much different than North Korea, with their assets and with their capabilities, and we can't deny where they are in the world. And I think that is the concern that I have with this administration. That is why we are here tonight talking about this. And I want to discuss some more about this, but I will yield back to my friend.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you.

As you said, the question, why do we care about Iran? It is actually a question I don't hear that often in my district because I think a lot of the people in my community understand that, when someone makes a threat to annihilate another country, you listen to the threat.

When we were in Israel—37 Democratic Members traveled to Israel in August, followed by a comparable sized group of Republican Members. On our trip, we had a chance to hear from a former chief of intelligence, Amos Yadlin. And he made the statement that the only existential threat to Israel is the marriage of ideology of destruction with nuclear capability. We face that threat now. That is why we are here having this conversation. That is why, over the last decade, we have worked diligently to create the archi-

ture of the sanctions regime that did, indeed, bring Iran to the negotiating table.

This joint interim agreement keeps the sanctions regime in place. But over the next 6 months, it is our responsibility—the United States, the United States Congress, our allies—to make sure that that sanctions regime not only stays in place, but stays robust and becomes stronger so that, again, Iran understands the challenges.

I have said many times that history is going to judge us with one question on Iran: Did we prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon? This moment in history faces us at this moment in time. This agreement must not be allowed to be permanent. The United States and our allies must ensure that Iran does not further move down the path to nuclear capability.

Iran is estimated to be months—at most, a year—away from a nuclear weapon. The next 6 months, if we are going to enforce this agreement, must make sure that Iran doesn't get any closer—not one moment, not 1 month, not 1 inch. This agreement has to be put in place in such a way that we can guarantee Iran is not moving forward.

What do some of those actions require from us? What I hope to do in the Foreign Affairs Committee and together with my Republican colleagues is to try to create a specific understanding of the timetables for implementation. The joint agreement doesn't lay that out. I want to know: What are the milestones? What are the expectations and deliverables that Iran must arrive at at each milestone? What is the proof we are going to require of Iran to demonstrate that they have achieved the specifications of the agreement at the specified time? And most importantly, what are the consequences if Iran doesn't achieve its milestones, if Iran uses its agreement to even start or try to delay?

We need to make sure we stay vigilant and we stay diligent to ensure that Iran can't move forward on its aspirations for a nuclear weapon.

With that, I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. You are exactly correct in how we move forward. Again, when you just put aspirational goals out there, you are going to get aspirational results sometimes, and that means nothing. And I think that is really where I see this agreement right now.

But I want to take, again—I believe that not only do you have a “what” and the reasons, but there is also sort of the “why” factor. And I have talked about that a lot from both sides of the aisle. Many times, we might not talk about the “why” a lot.

But I want to talk just for a moment about some of things that we are doing as well, about Israel and our relationship just from a “why” perspective, why this matters so much and the history that we have, for some who may be listening.

The U.S. and Israeli relationship really goes back to after World War II, and it had become apparent to the international community that the Jews needed a homeland of their own. In 1948, President Harry Truman recognized the State of Israel.

During the cold war, Israel was a key ally in stopping the spread of communism in the Arab world. The U.S. and Israel had a joint strategic interest in defeating aggressors in the Middle East seeking to influence their neighbors and disrupt the status quo, especially if they had Moscow's backing.

President John F. Kennedy told Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir:

The United States has a special relationship with Israel in the Middle East, really comparable only to what it has with Britain over a wide range of world affairs.

Since that bonding experience, the U.S. and Israel have approached their strategy to the region as a team, as a team. Of the five major Arab-Israeli military conflicts that have occurred over the decades, the one that highlights the U.S.-Israeli union the most is the Yom Kippur War. In this conflict, Israel was fighting the usual suspects—Egypt to the southeast along the Sinai Peninsula and Syria to the north along the Golan Heights.

This joint Arab initiative garnered the military support of Jordan and Iraq, while Egyptians received military hardware from the Soviet Union. Egypt and Syria launched a surprise attack on October 6, 1973, which was Israel's most holy day, Yom Kippur, the day of atonement.

The war inflicted heavy initial losses on Israel's army and air force, and by October 8, Israel's military prowess was in serious jeopardy. A quick call was made to Washington. The operation to resupply Israel began, code name Operation Nickel Grass.

□ 2015

By the end of Nickel Grass, the U.S. had shipped 22,395 tons of material to Israel. Israel received between 34 to 40 fighter bombers, 46 attack airplanes, 12 C-130 cargo planes, 8 helicopters, 200 tanks, and tons more of missiles and artillery pieces. It was one of the largest airlifts in U.S. history. The total cost of the military hardware delivered is estimated to be \$4.14 billion.

The airlift was a major shift in U.S.-Israeli relations. It brought about a greater U.S. involvement in Middle East affairs. After the Yom Kippur War, the United States quadrupled its foreign aid to Israel and replaced France as Israel's largest arms supplier. The doctrine of maintaining Israel's “qualitative military edge” over its Arab neighbors is said to have originated from this war.

This is where you and I, my colleague, stepped in.

I find this commonsense doctrine very important and aim to strengthen it with the legislation that we introduce, the Israel QME Enhancement Act. My bill requires the President to

report to Congress every 2 years the status of military sales to Middle Eastern countries other than Israel. H.R. 1992 ensures Congress is able to maintain its oversight of weapon sales in the region.

Furthermore, the legislation expands the scope of QME to bring to attention cyber and asymmetric warfare, something QME doesn't currently cover. During the Yom Kippur War, Israel was in need of conventional weapons. In the 21st century, war is being increasingly fought in cyberspace. Large conventional armies are less likely to mobilize, and countries are under siege from foreign terrorists, as we saw in Kenya.

Israel has stood out as the only country in the Middle East that promotes democratic, free market principles. Much like the U.S., Israel has an independent judicial system that protects the rights of individuals. Israel is governed by the rule of law and safeguards the freedoms of speech, press, and religion. As the U.S. has attempted to encourage Arab nations to espouse the tenets of a transparent society, they need to look no further than their democratic neighbor.

I want to pause right there and again yield to my friend as we continue this conversation and move forward on why this matters and bringing up these ideas of a relationship that is deeply rooted in history and of mutual sharing, and not one seemingly behind the back of the other.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. You talk about the relationship. As you noted, Harry S. Truman was the first to recognize the new state of Israel in 1948, after the British left the mandate. Immediately upon its declaration of independence, Israel was attacked by five nations. Throughout its history, Israel has faced hostility from its neighbors throughout the region.

Since 1973, the Yom Kippur War, as a 12-year-old boy I remember vividly coming out of synagogue that day, sitting in the back seat of my parents' car, listening to the radio, and not knowing if Israel was going to survive. It was an existential threat.

The United States and Israel have had an unbreakable relationship that continues to be to this very day an unbreakable, critically important relationship. Right now, the relationship between the United States and Israel has never been better across a whole variety of aspects: sharing of intelligence and sharing of military expertise. The United States has helped and jointly developed with Israel David's Sling, the Arrow system, and most recently helped fund the Iron Dome, which proved to be a game-changer in Israel's war in Gaza exactly a year ago this month. In that war, you will recall, rockets rained down on southern Israel from Gaza. Yet the Iron Dome system was able to intercept virtually all of those rockets, allowing Israel to avoid having to invade Gaza by land, achieving its goals and saving countless lives on both sides of the border. It

is the U.S.-Israel relationship that allows the development of such systems as Iron Dome and others.

I am also proud that we were able to work together—and I thank you for your support—for the Israel Qualitative Military Edge Enhancement Act. What used to take 4 years of review, at a time when changes in military capabilities are accelerating at an unprecedented pace, this act reduces to 2 years.

As you said, what used to be focused on strictly conventional weaponry, we understand that the current conflicts are taking place as much in cyberspace as airspace and ground. It is critical that Israel maintain its critical advantage, its qualitative military edge, in all aspects of that.

I was particularly proud that the Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously voted that bill to come to the floor, and I hope we will take it up here shortly as well.

The relationship between the United States and Israel is far more than military and security. We share values. We share understanding in science, developments of new medical technologies, medicines, and developments in agriculture.

The relationship between the United States and Israel is so strong because we share so much, and we understand that even on the security level, as much as Israel relies on the United States, the United States has benefited from Israel's security measures as well.

One must think no further than the Iraq war and go back to 1981, when Israel, against world condemnation, attacked the nuclear reactor at Osirak. One can only think what would have happened when the United States had its own conflict with Iraq in 1991, or 2003, if Iraq had had nuclear weapons.

The U.S.-Israel relationship is critical. It has been that way for the 65 years of Israel's existence. It has been incredibly important since 1973. We wouldn't have the Camp David Accords of 1979 and the peace between Israel and Egypt if not for the U.S. engagement. We wouldn't have the peace between Israel and Jordan if not for the work of the U.S. administrations.

It is critical that as we stand here fighting so hard for America's security, fighting so hard to prevent a nuclear Iran, that we understand that the mutual relationship between United States and Israel is a critical component of all of that.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

You have hit on it, and that is going back to this partnership. I think that is the best way to describe it. The partnership between U.S. and Israel, in so many ways, the values that we share and that you spoke of and the many things that have come about out of our relationship over the years not only benefit each country but the world around.

Most recently, Israel has been instrumental in assisting the U.S. in the

global war on terrorism. Since 9/11, U.S. and Israel have formed a strategic partnership to face a new and challenging world. The two nations are currently partners ranging from terrorism, proliferation, spread of radical Islamic ideology, narcotics, counterfeiting, weapons smuggling, and cyberwarfare.

There is cooperation on a wide range of intelligence-sharing programs that monitor terrorist and nation-state activities in the Middle East. Since 9/11, the U.S. and Israel have strengthened their homeland security partnership. The two nations have worked collectively on aviation, border and port, and mail and cybersecurity. This information and intelligence-sharing improves the security of both nations.

Israel has even provided tactical assistance in protecting U.S. troops as they fight terrorist organizations. Currently carried in any soldier's first aid kit is the "Israeli bandage," which acts as an immediate cauterizing agent upon contact. As someone who served in Iraq and in part of our Air Force and has worked with our Army and others, this is something that I have seen save lives. It is, again, a bonding between our two countries.

The Israelis developed the Joint Helmet-Mounted Cueing System used by the U.S. Air Force and Navy and several aircraft. It allows pilots to aim sensors and weapons wherever the pilot is looking.

An Israeli manufacturer specializing in add-armor has provided protection for U.S. Army vehicles currently being used in Afghanistan. The armor combats against rocket-propelled grenade attacks.

Several U.S. tactical ballistic missile systems use subcomponents developed and tested in Israel. These subcomponents are used in Patriot missiles. Another Israeli innovation saving American soldiers' lives is a radio frequency device that detects IEDs. As someone who saw the horror of an IED and the result thereof, that is something that I hold in great esteem.

You have already mentioned the Arrow antiballistic missile, David's Sling, and the Iron Dome. All of these have paid off. Our two militaries come together in missile defense training, including the biannual Juniper Cobra exercise in which they integrate tactics to counter the growing threat of ballistic missiles and long-range rockets. During 2012, this drill was combined with "Austere Challenge," the largest joint bilateral exercise ever conducted between two allied forces.

But our relationship is not just linked by defense and security operations. We are also engaged in cooperative efforts concerning energy, which is often not talked about. This is why this is so important to me, and important, I believe, to the world. It is not just a one-sided relationship; it is a partnership that we both can benefit from.

Both countries realize the hazards of being too dependent on oil. In 2008, a

cooperative agreement was signed between the two countries to produce alternative energy sources. This agreement brought together the U.S. Department of Energy and Israel's Ministry of Energy and Water Resources.

The joint venture has generated \$20 million in private sector investment in such areas as smart grid management, solar technology, and alternative fuels. The investment in this joint program has yielded greater revenue than the congressional investment of \$6.3 million. Israel has matched Congress' appropriations dollar-for-dollar. It is truly an equal partnership.

BrightSource Energy, a company that operates in the U.S. and Israel, is constructing the largest solar thermal energy project using technology developed in Israel. When the solar plant in California's Mojave Desert is operational, it will produce enough electricity to power 140,000 American homes.

Recently, a large natural gas field was discovered off Israel's shore. Noble Energy, a Houston-based energy company, has partnered with Israel's energy companies to develop its offshore fields. These opportunities strengthen the existing bond and create a less oil-dependent U.S. and world.

The U.S.-Israeli economic partnership is one of the most unique for the U.S. Our first free trade agreement was with the nation of Israel in 1985. In the past quarter of a century, U.S.-Israel trade has grown by 500 percent and exceeds \$78 million daily. More Israeli companies are trading on the NASDAQ than any company outside the United States and China.

U.S. firms such as Intel, Microsoft, Google, and Apple select Israel as one of their top destinations for international research and development. The free market environment in Israel is such that it attracts businesses seeing potential to invest and grow.

Even Berkshire Hathaway invests in Israel. When asked about why Warren Buffett invests in Israel, he answered that the economic spirit of both the U.S. and Israel is what makes it a no-nonsense investment.

Investment isn't one-sided. Between 2000 and 2009, Israeli companies have invested more than \$50 billion in the U.S. Israel is one of the biggest providers of investment in the United States. More than 15 U.S. States maintain offices in Israel.

Also, not just economics, not just military, but humanitarian aid as well. Assistance was provided by Israel to victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy, as well as to the refugees in Rwanda. Israel established field hospitals there, and several doctors and nurses were sent with medical supplies and vaccinations. Israeli humanitarian groups provided water desalination equipment in Sudan. In all, Israel provided \$7 million in humanitarian aid.

Haiti received a comprehensive hospital team from Israel. Eighteen tons of supplies and a medical team were

sent to Japan in the aftermath of the 2011 earthquake. A friend in the region, Turkey, received a total of 50 mobile structures and 80 housing structures to aid the victims of its 2011 earthquake.

When you look at this kind of cooperation, when you look at this kind of partnership, it is still hard for me to believe that we are here talking tonight about an agreement that has the potential for such great harm to not only ourselves, but to such a good ally and a partner.

With that, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. As we wrap up, let me just again express my sincerest gratitude for allowing me to participate this evening with you to talk about really two critically important issues: our unbreakable, special relationship with the free, independent Jewish state of Israel, and our necessary commitment to ensure that Iran never, ever is allowed to get a nuclear weapon capability. These two things come together at this moment in a crucial way.

I am reminded, as we close, of a famous saying by a rabbi and ancient scholar. Because, as you touched on, the United States and Israel share more than just a security arrangement. They share more than technology, even though a lot of the companies you mentioned—Apple, Intel, and Google—have more research dollars invested in Israel than any other country outside the United States.

Both countries, I am proud to say—the United States and Israel—have a sense of an obligation to give back to the rest of the world, to lean in to make a difference in peoples' lives.

You have talked about Haiti. One of the stories I have always loved is that one of the first relief ships to make it to Haiti was an Israel field hospital. There is a story about a woman who was giving birth shortly after the earthquake. She named her child Israel in honor of the doctors who flew in from Tel Aviv immediately after the earthquake—because they understand the need for emergency care and emergency times.

□ 2030

But they were joined there by efforts of our own soldiers, United States soldiers, who understood in our own hemisphere and also around the world the need to give help, to lend a hand, when people are in need. We saw the same thing in the Philippines after the tragic typhoon. We saw American ships coming from nearby, and we saw Israelis and Americans coming from far away. Those are the types of things that unite us.

As Rabbi Hillel said:

If I am not for myself, who will be? But if I am only for myself, what am I?

The third line of his saying, I think, is crucial at this moment as we look to Iran:

If not now, when?

We need to make sure that the United States, that the P5+1 and that

our regional allies can come together and guarantee that Iran does not become a nuclear-capable country. We need to make sure that the regional security is maintained and that the nuclear weapon is prevented. That is our role, and that is how history will judge us. That is why we are here talking tonight.

So, again, I thank you from the bottom of my heart. I thank you for the work we have done together. It is a privilege to work with you, and I look forward to working together on other issues, including this.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate my friend for being here tonight as you have added so much to this debate, but I also appreciate your time here in standing up for what we both feel is a very important role in the American-Israeli relationship.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Israel is an ally well worth protecting. We recognize and understand the serious threat posed to Israel from nation-states such as Iran as well as from radical Islamic terrorist groups such as Hamas, Hezbollah, and al Qaeda. U.S.-Israel cooperation helps ensure that Israel will remain a shining example of what democratic ideals and a freedom-loving society can achieve.

I agree with my friend. Iran cannot be allowed to develop nuclear weapons. That is not a negotiating point. That is just a fact. When we understand that, I will support real solutions, with real triggers, with real time lines in order to dismantle a program that has not been based on a freedom-loving people just wanting an energy source but one that has been based on deception, that has been based on deceit, and that has been based on an underlying hatred of the West and especially of Israel. We cannot let that happen.

I pray that this administration and the others that have joined in this agreement do not fall victim to a pretty PR campaign. Israel has been a beacon of liberty despite the reign of despots all around them. Israel has never allowed a threat of attack to shake their recognition that the best way to thwart extremist ideals is to stay free. Now is the time for America to renew its commitment to Israel.

God bless this union and the United States.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois, my friend, for being here and for the work that we have done together, and I do look forward to the QME bill's coming to this floor, of its passing in the Senate, and of seeing the President sign it as a good faith effort to show that his commitment is there for Israel as well. I look forward to that day being with you as that happens.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS' HOUR OF POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). Under the Speaker's

announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today, along with the distinguished gentleman from the Silver State, my good friend, Representative HORSFORD, proudly coanchoring the CBC Special Order, what we have termed throughout the year as our "hour of power." With these 60 minutes, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about issues of great significance that affect the folks back home in our congressional districts and that, in many instances, impact the entire Nation.

Today, we have gathered here to look back at the issues that members of the CBC have tackled individually and collectively throughout the year on behalf of the American people, but we look back in order to look forward as we anticipate the challenges that we confront in the next year on a whole variety of issues. Throughout the year, we have come to the floor every Monday that we have been in session in order to address a great many issues of significance to the American people.

We came to the floor in early February to deal with comprehensive immigration reform. Then we addressed the need to preserve section 5 of the Voting Rights Act during the week in which the Supreme Court was holding oral argument. We confronted the challenges in and around sequestration. We presented the CBC's people's budget, which sets forth a more progressive way forward in order to deal with the economic challenges that we confront in this country. We addressed health care disparities, the student loan crisis, poverty and income inequality in America, entrepreneurship. We had the opportunity to reflect and to celebrate the life and the legacy of a former distinguished Member of this august body, Representative Bill Gray, from the great State of Pennsylvania. We reviewed economic security through the labor movement. We stood up, of course, for the Affordable Care Act. We addressed the debt ceiling and the need not to hold the American economy hostage. We confronted hunger in America and the absolute moral imperative to stop the more than \$39 billion in cuts that our friends on the other side of the aisle would like to make to the SNAP program.

These are the issues that, throughout this year, we have taken to the floor of the House of Representatives to talk directly to the American people about the issues that we are working on on their behalf.

Today, I am pleased that so many distinguished members of the CBC have come to join us, including the distinguished chairperson, who has led us admirably and with great courage and intelligence and clarity throughout the entire year. I am now pleased to be able to yield to the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio, the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, Representative MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES, for yielding.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues, Congressmen JEFFRIES and HORSFORD, for leading this CBC Special Order hour and for leading 16 CBC Special Order hours this year. It has been a pleasure to listen to you both. The information that you have shared with the American public is to be commended, and I thank you both because, week after week, you have led the CBC in discussions that promote increased opportunity, justice, and a better America for all Americans.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting you both for bringing our message to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, 2013 has been a challenging year. Partisan gridlock has made this year one of the least productive in the history of the U.S. Congress. To date, Congress has passed only 52 bills into law, and if you remove the ceremonial legislation, that number shrinks to 42, almost matching the 41 laws passed in 2011, which was, to date, the least productive year in the history of the Congress.

It is far too easy to simply point fingers, but this much is clear: Congress is failing the American people.

Partisan grandstanding has paralyzed our legislative branch, leaving our country unable to move forward to prepare for a rapidly changing and uncertain world. Facing widespread economic and political instability, America looks to Congress for leadership. The CBC has risen to this challenge, working with both sides of the aisle and both Chambers of Congress.

This year, the CBC addressed the government shutdown, our Federal budget process, gun violence, voting rights, justice reform, education reform, and so much more. The members of the CBC also led efforts to directly engage underserved communities on the benefits of the Affordable Care Act; to improve the judicial nomination and confirmation process; in discussing the pressing issues related to immigration reform, especially for those of the African diaspora; and we convened a summit on the culture of violence in our communities.

I am proud of the CBC for our bipartisan solution-oriented approach to the most pressing issues facing our country, and despite the tough legislative environment, the CBC consistently looks to build coalitions and to enact solutions that will benefit all Americans. Unfortunately, a deeply divided Congress has prevented America from reaping the benefits of our efforts.

As we move into next year, Congress must end our crisis-oriented budget cycle. Our inability to end the sequester, to move past the failed policy of austerity and to generate new sources of revenue will slow economic growth and leave all but the very wealthy behind. We are a great Nation, but we cannot sustain our standing unless we end the partisan political gamesmanship and live up to the promise of America. Working together, we can create a more prosperous America in which the only ceilings to our potential are the limits of our own imaginations.

Mr. Speaker, in 2 weeks, the first session of the 113th Congress will come to a close. It will be the end of a Congress marked with missed opportunities and hyperpartisan games. The Congressional Black Caucus is prepared to make 2014 the year Congress moves beyond the partisan politics of years past, ends our legislative paralysis, restores faith in our government, and brings prosperity back to the American people.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished chairperson of the CBC for her thoughtful and eloquent remarks and, certainly, for making the point that we as members of the CBC have come to Washington to try and make a difference on behalf of the people whom we represent back home and throughout the entire Nation. We have come to work together to try and find common ground, to promote solutions for the American people in the face of the difficult challenges that we have confronted. We didn't come to deal with a government shutdown that cost \$24 billion in lost economic productivity or to deal with this constant obsession with the Affordable Care Act and the consistent effort to delay, defund, or destroy the opportunity to give tens of millions of otherwise uninsured Americans access to health care.

Hopefully, as the first session of the 113th Congress winds to a close and as we move toward the opportunity to get some things done next year, we can find our way toward a more productive second half of the 113th Congress.

I am pleased that we have been joined by the distinguished architect of the Congressional Black Caucus' budget as well as by a member of the Judiciary Committee, who has worked hard on issues of social and economic justice. He is here today to share with the American people the work that the CBC has done in putting forth a more progressive, inclusionary budget that works for working families, middle class Americans, and seniors.

I yield now to Representative BOBBY SCOTT from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Nevada and the chair from Ohio for their strong work and, particularly, for talking about some of the things that the Congressional Black Caucus has accomplished over the last year.

I want to take an opportunity to highlight the CBC's work on advocating for a responsible budget, on offering responsible solutions to address the budget deficit, to cancel the sequester, and to grow the economy.

Last March, we offered our budget for fiscal year 2014 as an alternative to the budget that was adopted by the House. The CBC budget makes tough choices but not at the expense of our most vulnerable communities. The CBC budget offers a concrete plan that both cancels the economically disastrous sequester and then pays for that cancellation. Our budget is able to do so while also protecting Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP nutrition benefits, and other vital safety net programs that protect millions of Americans from poverty.

□ 2045

The CBC budget also reduces the Nation's budget deficit by approximately \$2.8 trillion over the next decade compared to the February baseline calculated by the Congressional Budget Office.

Other ideas have been presented in the past to either cancel the sequester or reduce the deficit, but they almost always include significant cuts to Social Security and Medicare. These ideas have included changing the way the Social Security benefits are calculated—the so-called chained CPI, which reduces the cost of living benefits—or raising the age of eligibility for Medicare from 65 to 67.

The CBC budget is able to pay for the cancellation of the sequester and reduce the budget deficit without these harmful cuts to Social Security and Medicare.

Our budget is in stark contrast to the Republican budget that passed the House earlier this year. That budget claimed—claimed—to reduce the budget deficit by \$4.6 trillion over the next decade by making draconian spending cuts in non-defense discretionary spending and unspecified savings in mandatory spending. That is the category that is mostly comprised of Social Security and Medicare. They are going to get savings, better known as “cuts.”

That budget also included a \$5.7 trillion tax cut that was paid for with an asterisk—meaning that the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee would have to figure out how to fill the \$5.7 trillion hole. Now, arithmetic requires you to recognize that you can only fill that hole by either raising taxes or in additional cuts. We know that the Republicans are opposed to tax increases, and the only real big ticket item left that can come anywhere close to filling that hole would be Social Security and Medicare—the only thing left on the table to pay for that.

The CBC budget does not include an asterisk or other types of budget gimmicks. Our budget outlines a concrete plan that makes tough choices and pre-

sents credible options that can be used to achieve our budget reduction targets.

The CBC budget calls for revenue enhancements totaling \$2.7 trillion over the next decade. Our budget outlines how the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee can reach this number by highlighting several revenue options totaling \$4.2 trillion that could be used to reach the \$2.7 trillion revenue target.

These revenue options include: \$1.1 trillion that can be obtained by limiting deductibility of corporate interest payments; \$1 trillion by closing special tax breaks and corporate loopholes; over \$800 billion by taxing capital gains and dividends as ordinary income; almost half a trillion dollars by having a 5.4 percent surcharge on that portion of your income over \$1 million; over \$300 billion by enacting a Wall Street Trading and Speculators tax of 0.25 percent; \$200 billion by ending the Bush-era tax cuts or that portion of your income over \$250,000; over \$100 billion by returning to the estate tax exemption that was in existence in 2009; and over \$100 billion by reducing the tax gap through better enforcement of the IRS Tax Code.

Those are specifics. They may be unpopular, but at least they are specific, in stark contrast to go find \$5.7 trillion unspecified that the Republican budget included.

The revenue enhancements provided in the CBC budget would allow Congress to totally cancel the sequester and then pass a jobs package of at least \$500 billion. At \$50,000 each, that is over 10 million jobs that could be created in 1 year with a jobs bill of that magnitude—almost enough to hire everybody drawing unemployment today and to provide an additional \$300 billion in long-term investments in our economy through education, job training, health care, and advanced science and research.

As I said earlier, the reforms contained in the CBC budget would reduce the deficit \$2.8 trillion over the next decade compared to CBO's baseline. That would put our Nation on a strong sustainable path, all without jeopardizing programs that support our seniors and programs that educate the next generation of leaders and business, science, and technology.

As we move forward to 2014 and the next budget deadline, the Congressional Black Caucus will continue to advocate these priorities contained in our budget.

It is imperative that Congress pass a budget that expands economic opportunity, invests in the American people, and reduces our deficit. The CBC budget presents a concrete plan—backed by actual numbers, not by asterisks—that shows how we can reduce our deficit while not being required to make further cuts in vital programs that support our Nation's safety net, especially Social Security and Medicare.

Most importantly, the CBC budget presents a clear path towards both eco-

nomie prosperity and fiscal responsibility for our Nation.

I want to thank the CBC budget for the opportunity to work on this budget because it is a responsible budget, does the right thing, and it has specifics that you can actually look at, in stark contrast to the asterisk gimmicks and other assumptions that cannot be fulfilled without going into Social Security and Medicare that the Republican budget has.

I yield back to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for his very thoughtful exposition and explanation about the CBC budget and the fact that there really are two different visions that have been set forth when comparing the CBC budget and the Republican budget.

The CBC budget, of course, is designed to promote progress for the many. The budget presented by the House majority is designed to promote, in our view, prosperity for the few. The CBC budget creates a balanced approach to deficit reduction that invests in the economy, protects important social safety net programs like Social Security and Medicare. The House GOP budget balances itself on the backs of working families, the poor, the most vulnerable Americans in our society. That, I believe, is the wrong approach to take as it relates to the well-being of the American people.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for his thoughts and his work on that progressive document that the CBC has put forth.

It is now my honor to yield to our distinguished co-anchor for the CBC Special Order, who has been with us throughout the year anchoring, articulating, putting forth the CBC vision on a vast array of issues important to our districts and to the American people.

Today, I believe he is going to speak to us about the work that he has led in partnership with other members of the CBC and folks on our side of the aisle for fair, racially inclusive, and equitable America.

Let me yield to my good friend, Representative STEVEN HORSFORD.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you. I would like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my good friend from the State of New York. One of the great pleasures of being a Member of this body is getting to know colleagues from across the State. We have a dynamic freshman class—five Members who are freshmen in the Congressional Black Caucus. It has been my honor to co-anchor this hour of the Special Order for the Congressional Black Caucus with my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

I would like to commend him for his tremendous leadership on a breadth of issues that have come before this Congress. Even recently in his role as a member of the Judiciary Committee, some legislation that we will be considering just this week is going to happen

because this Member has worked across the aisle to bring people together to try to seek common ground. It is what we need more of, Mr. Speaker. One of the things that we are doing here tonight is reflecting after a year in this 113th Congress.

I am a new Member. I have been here now, like I said, for just over a year after being elected. My constituents back home in Nevada ask me often, so what is it like to be a Member of Congress? You know, do you feel good about what it is you are able to accomplish? It is an honor, it is a great honor, to serve the people of Nevada's Fourth Congressional District here in the people's House, the House of Representatives. It is a great honor, and I am proud to be a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, which has colleagues who are some of the most committed proponents of progressive social and progressive economic justice legislation that comes before this Congress.

As honorable as this position is, as proud of a moment that it is for me personally, when I hear the statistics that were read by our chairwoman, Chair FUDGE, that less than 50 bills that have been passed by Congress have become law, that is rather frustrating, and it is frustrating to the American people.

Prior to coming to Congress I served in the State legislature in Nevada. We only meet every other year for 4 months. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, in 4 months—in 120 days—we considered and passed approximately 1,000 bills. Think about that. One State can consider and approve approximately 1,000 bills in 120 days every other year, but 435 Members in the House of Representatives in more than a year have been able to accomplish less than 50 bills becoming law.

That is why the American public is so frustrated. So while I reflect on this year, there are areas that I am proud of in accomplishments that we have made. Unfortunately, there are bills that have been proposed that have not moved and legislation that is still pending in this body.

My hope is that, as we reflect on this first year in the 113th Congress, that it will challenge us as Members to come prepared in 2014 to get the people's job done. There are a number of key bills that we need to focus on. As my colleague has talked about, we have fought to ensure our justice system is more fair and protects all citizens equally under the law. We have fought to increase access to affordable health care, something that is desperately needed for millions upon millions of Americans. Our leaders have worked to fight to preserve and to protect important social safety nets like SNAP benefits and Medicare and Medicaid because we have made it our mission to protect America's most vulnerable citizens.

We have time and time again called for the sequester to be ended. I just met with constituents in my district in

Nevada who said, please don't allow a government shutdown to happen again in January, don't allow these cuts under the sequester; the second round of cuts would be even more harmful, let alone the first round to take hold.

Despite these areas, there is work to be done. One of the issues that I have been particularly involved with, as a member of this Congressional Black Caucus, has been immigration reform, the need for comprehensive immigration reform.

I am proud to have served as one of the cochairs, along with my colleague, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Representative CLARKE, also from New York, as cochairs of the Congressional Black Caucus' Immigration Reform Task Force. We have worked tirelessly with other House Democrats to craft a bipartisan commonsense bill, H.R. 15, which aims to begin fixing our broken immigration system.

It would grow our economy, we know, by 5 percent in just two decades, reduce our deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars, create thousands of jobs, and, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, it would bring millions of people out of the shadows and into society, including thousands of DREAMers, by creating a pathway to citizenship, all while shoring up our border security.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I know my colleague, Mr. JEFFRIES, on the Judiciary Committee, we have worked time and time again on legislation to bring forward proposals on comprehensive immigration reform. We are asking our colleagues on the other side to join with us to make these things possible, to not just talk about it, to not be proud or pleased with just 50 bills being passed by one of the least productive Congresses in the history, but to actually accomplish things that the American public expects us to accomplish.

Another top priority that I would like to talk about this evening, Mr. Speaker, that we have been working on with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus is preventing racial profiling practices in our law enforcement that have been hurting individuals across the country.

Our citizens deserve to live free from fear, especially among those whose jobs are to serve and to protect. That is why I introduced the Universal RESPECT Act, a bill that would help prevent racial profiling practices from occurring.

The Universal RESPECT Act will establish an interagency review of Federal efforts to eliminate racial profiling in the United States by amending the Homeland Security Act to require that recipients of Federal law enforcement grants and training facilities do not engage in racial profiling.

□ 2100

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, the Universal RESPECT Act will end the practice of rewarding law enforcement programs that do not respect basic civil

rights and civil liberties. We need to make sure we stay vigilant in our fight for justice in this country, and that has been a constant theme in the Congressional Black Caucus's legislative agenda, whether it is on the budget, as our colleague, Mr. SCOTT just talked about, or a plethora of bills that have been brought forward by individual members, and is central to the FY14 budget that has been worked on by the Congressional Black Caucus which reduces the budget and creates millions of jobs in a fair and balanced way.

Let me just close by talking about one final area, Mr. Speaker, that we as Members of this body need to stay focused on, and that is jobs and growing the economy. In my home State of Nevada, we still have a stubbornly high unemployment rate above the national average. Despite improvements in certain sectors, there are far too many Nevadans who are still looking for work, many who have been out of work a year, year and a half, going on 2 years. And I know as part of the budget debate that will occur between now and January 15 will be a discussion about extending unemployment benefits, which is incredibly important to American families who have been struggling during this sustained recession.

So I would challenge my colleagues on the other side, allow us to bring forward the number of jobs legislation and bills that would help build our infrastructure back up in this country. Allow us to bring these bills to a vote in this Chamber so that we can get our country moving again, we can get the middle class economy moving, we can help middle class families who are trying to provide for themselves and their families with good, sustainable, family-sustainable jobs, not low-wage jobs that put people in the same position to depend on assistance programs by the Federal Government. That is not what the American public wants. They want a family-sustaining job that allows them to provide for themselves and their family. That is what we are arguing for. It is what the Congressional Black Caucus represents each and every week when we come to this Special Order hour and why these issues are incredibly important.

So as we reflect back on this year, this year of missed opportunities, as my colleague from New York just said, it is in fact missed opportunities because we could have done so much more in this body. There are 435 Members, dedicated staff, people who love our country and want to see it progress, but it is time for us to put the partisanship, the ideological views aside and to allow us to put our country first. That is what I am here for, Mr. Speaker. I know it is what my colleagues are here for, and I look forward to working with anyone from either side of the aisle from either Chamber who wants to work with the President to move our country forward, and I appreciate this Special Order time.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from the Silver

State for his observations and for his look forward as it relates to the issues that we all hope this Congress will decide to tackle as we close out the first half of the 113th Congress and move toward calendar year 2014.

This has been a year of lost opportunities, of obstruction, of delay, of distraction, and a failure to meaningfully address the issues of importance to the American people. This has been a very schizophrenic economic recovery. We have come a long way since the collapse of the economy in 2008, but we still have a long way to go.

As members of the CBC have consistently pointed out from the floor of the House of Representatives, there are people who have been left behind, and the American people deserve this Congress putting aside issues of partisan bickering and to attempt to find common ground to solve their problems.

The stock market is way up. Corporate profits are way up. Productivity of the American people, way up. CEO compensation is way up, yet unemployment still remains stubbornly high. There are Americans who have been left behind, and we have failed to take up a jobs bill from the floor of the House of Representatives at any point this year.

As my colleague from Nevada also pointed out, we have a very broken immigration system. There is almost uniform agreement across the aisle about that fact. Yet there has been a failure to bring a meaningful piece of immigration reform legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives, despite the overwhelming demand for action by the American people.

Now, we all agree, as the CBC indicated earlier this year in February when we took to the floor to talk about the need to address the issue of the broken immigration system, that something needs to be done. And there really only are three possible options:

One, we have mass deportation of the 11 million undocumented individuals who are in this country. That is option number one;

Option number two is the status quo; just leave the broken immigration system in place;

Option number three is meaningful, comprehensive immigration reform with a tough but fair pathway towards citizenship.

Mass deportation is impractical; the status quo, unacceptable. Comprehensive immigration reform is the right thing to do for this country, for the economy, and for the American people.

I am hopeful, as my colleague from Nevada indicated, that that is the direction that we will go in as we speed to a close this year and attempt to restart the Congress after the end of the first half of this session.

I am pleased that we have been joined by the distinguished gentlelady from Texas who is a member of both the House Judiciary Committee and the Homeland Security Committee. She has worked on many issues. She is

a leader within the Congressional Black Caucus and is a leader within the Congress on the issues of social and economic justice. It is now my honor and privilege to yield to her, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from New York. It was thought provoking to hear the gentleman from Nevada offer his thoughts of bipartisanship and to listen to the astute gentleman from Virginia on the many issues that have been left along the highway of despair, and also to be joined by Congresswoman CLARKE from New York, whom we will hear from shortly.

Let me thank you for the leadership you have given to this special time, and let me try to work to be succinct on the issues that have been left along the highway of despair.

You started out with immigration reform, and you were kind enough to note that I have served on the Judiciary Committee for a number of years, formerly the ranking member on the Immigration Subcommittee, and now the ranking member on the Border Security and Maritime Subcommittee.

I will tell you that there are many times when we could have come together and passed comprehensive immigration reform, but I am going to tout as a bipartisan legitimate expression of border security, to share with my colleagues H.R. 1417, which many know was passed out of the Homeland Security House committee through the efforts of Republicans joined by Democrats, and the legislation passed with no weaknesses, no loopholes, no disrespect for the importance of the security of the northern and southern border. There were very strong responses as it relates to operational control, as it relates to the amount of control that we would have at the border, but matching it with the recognition that there must be an infrastructure of immigration reform. But let me throw all those words away and say there must be humanity. There must be concern for human beings, for families torn apart, for DREAM children destined to be valedictorians or salutatorians or to be generals in the United States military. We are losing the talent of those who have trained here with knowledge about the next level of technology because of the no H-1B because we do not have a comprehensive approach. Those folks are leaving, and, therefore, we are losing the geniuses that we trained to be able to help us.

So I want to join the gentleman and say to him that, if there is any cause on which we can come together, it would be comprehensive immigration reform. Might I just take note of my button that honors the Fast for Families, those that have been fasting for almost 20 days, almost a month, because they are trying to pull at the heartstrings of America and the heartstrings of this Congress to recognize that they are Americans, too. They are just a few blocks down the

street. A few blocks down the street, families, children are fasting, asking, Is there someone who can hear our plea?

So I thank the gentleman for bringing it up, and I just want to make some other points that we have been lingering on and have not followed through on.

I introduced H.R. 2585, which is an antibullying bill, Prevention of Bullying and Intervention, and reflects where America is when you can find most every child that is interviewed has indicated that they have been bullied; or something happens to a child in high school, and they will talk about having been bullied some years back; or a child will be shot or violence will occur, and they will talk about bullying, even to the extent it is raised up in the NFL. And I want to pay tribute to a young man at the Baltimore Ravens, Mr. Rice, who has taken this cause up from the NFL.

H.R. 2585 would reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant, and it would provide sort of a sentence road map that allows organizations that would be funded under the block grant to be able to focus on bullying prevention and intervention. How simple a legislative initiative is that? And I would offer to say that I heard from leadership on both sides of the aisle. So why not pass something as simple as that even before Christmas to be able to move forward on something that would not, in fact, be a negative?

I just quickly want to indicate that we have young people exposed to violence in ways that we have not known. Thirty percent of U.S. students in grades 6 through 10 are involved in moderate or frequent bullying. There are cases in Florida where young people have been arrested because, tragically, someone committed suicide, or the hearing I held in Houston where parents upon parents and students came in to testify how they had been bullied. One out of four kids is bullied. Some would say they are calling everything bullying. Well, I believe if we do the outreach, we can find a way to develop an infrastructure so that there will be people who find the comfort of knowing someone cares, a system that intervenes when someone feels something is untoward, and to break the shackles of bullying by getting rid of the atmosphere that is tolerated because it is done in silence and fear.

I also introduced gun safety legislation, and I would hope that some day we could have universal background checks. As I was driving to the airport, I read an ad in the Houston Chronicle that had gun safes on sale. I said that guy, I want to give him an award, because my simple legislation requires individuals to store their guns. They can have all the guns they want, but have them stored and safe, particularly if you have a large number of them, to be able to secure and protect children and those who want to do us harm.

One of the things that the CBC worked on, and I am proud that we

worked on it, but I will say that it brings me sadness, we are at a point where we have cut \$40 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition program. I went to my food bank and had them explain what a devastating impact that \$40 billion, \$4 billion a year, will have on the people who are in need in Houston in particular.

□ 2115

In my city of Houston, the census report said over the last 12 months, 442,881 incomes were below the poverty level, and 18 percent of households in the State of Texas in 2009 through 2011 ranked second in the highest rate of food security. So why can we not have an ag bill that would restore the \$40 billion? Why are we suggesting that those individuals are deadbeats when one-half of the persons on food stamps or SNAP are, in fact, children? That is something, Mr. JEFFRIES, that we could come together on and redo or the conference could redo. We could look to ensure a place of laws but a place of humanity.

In conclusion, allow me to throw in two disparate points, but I consider them justice issues. First, that is the Affordable Care Act, which is a justice initiative. It is to say that we all have access to good health care. That is not a carte blanche for good health because we must all change our attitudes and do a lot of things to make us healthy, but it certainly is an intervener that allows to us have preventive care; it allows women to not be characterized as a preexisting disease because they are pregnant; it allows children born with preexisting diseases not to be eliminated from the insurance rolls; and it allowed 13 million Americans to receive \$1.1 billion in rebates from their health insurance last year when the Affordable Care Act was in place. Now 105 million Americans have free preventive services.

So all of the talk of the technology takes away from the core value that Americans should have access to health care, and today I am glad to hear that we are making strides in a technological system that is not always perfect. Let us not undermine this bill. I am very glad that the Congressional Black Caucus, under the leadership of our chairwoman, has been strong in educating our constituents about the Affordable Care Act.

In conclusion, a remaining challenge that we have: the Voting Rights Act must be reauthorized to the extent of a provision that was eliminated by the Supreme Court decision wrongly, *Shelby County v. Holder*, that took away the provisions of preclearance which, in fact, provided justice and the right to vote for all Americans. We are gathered, hopefully, in a bipartisan manner with the leadership of Mr. SENBRENNER and others who are on various committees in the Congressional Black Caucus and the leadership of our Democratic Caucus and the Republican conference to come together in a bipar-

tisan manner to be able to accept the constitutional premise best said by the Declaration of Independence: that we all are created equally with certain inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We have coddled the right to vote. We have welcomed the right to vote. I am reading a story about our Puerto Rican citizens who don't have the right to vote and how they felt like second-class citizens. There are those of us on the mainland that have had roadblocks thrown across the pathway that needed to be protected not only by the Bill of Rights but by the Voting Rights Act that has withstood the test of time, that has been reviewed. So it is important that we get a construct that all of us can support so that if there is a voter ID law, it does not block people from voting, it does not keep one particular group from getting a voter ID law because they do not have access, like in Texas with the Department of Public Safety. In essence, the Voting Rights Act is one that reaffirms America's commitment that every person has a right to vote—one person, one vote.

I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus for being a leader on so many issues, from preventing gun violence to the issue of dealing with our children and anti-bullying and intervention, to the idea of the Affordable Care Act, to restoring SNAP funding, to the Voting Rights Act and, yes, to a comprehensive approach to immigration reform, particularly the idea that we worked on so extensively, and that is diversity visas.

When I go home and speak to people from all walks of life, particularly the African community, they understand the work the Congressional Black Caucus has done—the Haitians, those from the Caribbean, those from South Asia—in reuniting families. They understand that we have been a leader on the broad landscape of comprehensive immigration reform.

For that reason, I am hoping that we will not end this session by looking sadly back on what we have not done, but that we will roll up our sleeves. I also hope that before we leave here before the end of this particular first session of the 113th Congress, we will have the opportunity to see an ag bill that will restore a portion of the SNAP dollars, helping those who cannot help themselves; that we will actually have passed anti-bullying legislation that should draw Republicans and Democrats together; that we will have confronted the issue of comprehensive immigration reform, listened to the voices of reason, and passed legislation in regular order and then, as well, that we in conclusion find it within ourselves to eliminate the sequester in a way that provides funding back to the basic responsibilities of this government in rebuilding infrastructure, creating jobs, stopping the bleeding of losing jobs because we have kept the sequester long overdue; funding our de-

fense; providing for education and the safety and security of our seniors and our veterans. Let's get to work.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for reminding us that we came here to roll up our sleeves and to work for the American people.

I introduced the above legislation H.R. 2585 to save our children's lives.

SUMMARY OF BILL

H.R. 2585 will help to stem this epidemic by reauthorizing for 5 years Juvenile Accountability Block Grant program (JABG) and providing funding to state and local governments for the creation of bullying and gang prevention programs.

Legislation authorizes such appropriations as may be necessary, which is anticipated to be at least \$40 million per year (\$200 million total) for the 5 year reauthorization period.

In addition to reauthorizing juvenile justice programs, legislation clarifies how to address the occurrences of bullying through developmentally appropriate intervention and prevention techniques, which center on evidence-based models and best practices that rely on schools and communities rather than involvement from law enforcement and the justice system.

Legislation designed to help both the victims and perpetrators of bullying. Research studies have shown that approximately 25 percent of school bullies will be convicted of a criminal offense in their adult years.

H.R. 2585 also includes provisions for gang prevention programs, which will help guide our children towards socially beneficial paths.

If we want our children to learn, we must be able to maintain a safe and healthy school environment.

WHY H.R. 2585 IS NECESSARY

Although some people may dismiss bullying as a normal part of growing up, bullying can be detrimental to a child's education and development.

Each day an estimated 160,000 students in this country refuse to go to school because they fear being bullied by their peers, and many more attend school in a chronic state of anxiety and depression.

In addition, six out of ten American youth witness bullying at least once a day, and nearly 30 percent—or 5.7 million children—are involved in bullying as victims, perpetrators, or both.

1 in 7 Students in Grades K–12 is either a bully or a victim of bullying.

90% of 4th to 8th Grade Students report being victims of bullying of some type.

56% of students have personally witnessed some type of bullying at school.

71% of students report incidents of bullying as a problem at their school.

87% of youth said shootings are motivated by a desire to "get back at those who have hurt them, and 86% said, "other kids picking on them, making fun of them or bullying them" causes teenagers to turn to lethal violence in the schools.

Consequences of bullying:

15% of all school absenteeism is directly related to fears of being bullied.

1 out of every 10 students who drops out of school does so because of repeated bullying. Suicides linked to bullying are the saddest statistic.

Behind these statistics are real children and young people who suffer and hurt too often in

silence. Let me tell you the heart breaking story of David Ray Ritcheson.

David Ray Ritcheson was a victim of adolescent bullying. He was 16 years of age—when he was bullied, beaten and tortured nearly to death.

David was assaulted while attending a party in Spring, Texas. He spent 3 months in a hospital as a result of his injuries and underwent more than 30 surgeries to repair his battered body.

His courage in the face of such violence was reflected in his willingness to come before Congress to tell his story.

My reaction to his courage and later death by suicide was to sponsor House Resolution to honor the life and sacrifice of David Ray Ritcheson. The Resolution told his story and expressed the importance of passing hate crime legislation; and his story also showed the violence of bullying.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas for her leadership on a wide variety of issues important to the social and economic justice landscape, and, of course, for laying out a very significant roadmap, a blueprint for the future in terms of what this Congress should confront as we close out this first session of the 113th Congress and move toward the second session.

We are pleased that we have also been joined by my neighbor back home in Brooklyn, the distinguished gentlewoman from the Ninth Congressional District, a woman who is one of the CBC cochairs on the task force related to comprehensive immigration reform. She has been a leader on that issue, as she has on many others. She is a member of the Small Business Committee, as well as the Homeland Security Committee. She represents one of the most diverse districts anywhere in this Nation and has made us all proud to call her a colleague. I yield now to Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) for their leadership in anchoring this year's CBC Special Order hour and thank them in particular for this evening here in review.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long road. From fighting to keep SNAP funding to rehashing the Affordable Care Act to advocating for immigration reform that is truly diverse and comprehensive, the CBC has come a long way.

As one of the cochairs of the CBC immigration task force, I am proud of the work we have done to ensure that everyone, including immigrants of the African diaspora and African Americans, were adequately included and represented in this conversation.

It feels like it was just yesterday when we stood here in February introducing the CBC's perspective on the urgent need for comprehensive immigration reform. That night, we laid the foundation of what was to be an uphill battle between politics, policy, and procedure. The CBC, along with our Tri-Caucus colleagues, argued that the

burden of the broken immigration system does not encumber one group of immigrants alone. For example, there are approximately 3 million immigrants from the African diaspora in the United States, the vast majority of whom entered the country with legal documentation, but there are millions more from all over the world, including eastern Europe and South Asia.

As the conversation increased, the CBC immigration task force tried to highlight the impact of immigrants of the African diaspora from the continent of Africa, the Caribbean region, and South and Central America, which has been large in scale. Their contribution has not been mentioned in the Main Street stories representing reform. Many did not recognize nor understand that the road for many immigrants of the diaspora was significantly different than the proverbial stories in the media.

Many entered our Nation with legal student visas, like my own parents did, to pursue careers in medicine, science, education, and other professions. Many are proud business owners of law firms, restaurants, grocery stores, shipping companies, and hair-braiding venues. There are those who have come as asylum seekers fleeing the tumult of war, famine, and genocide. Like any other immigrant group, they come to the United States to be productive, tax-paying members of our civil society, to attain the American Dream.

Like the other immigrant groups, immigrants of the African diaspora are dealing with backlogged immigration processing, families being ripped apart, falling out of status because they have aged out of the legal immigration process; racial and status discrimination; unfair criminal aggravated felony laws that prohibit judicial review; deportation processes that violate civil and human rights; an insecure, prohibitive student visa program; and limited access to work permits and much more.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative for us to acknowledge the fact that many immigrants arrive on our shores during a time of their lives when they are in the most productive years of their lives. Any delay in processing these individuals, bringing them to the fore, would deny us as a Nation the opportunity to access their talent, their skill, and abilities in the prime of their lives.

Additionally, it was important for us to note that African Americans, those descendants of the transatlantic slave trade, whom I fondly call "longtime stakeholders" of this Nation, have been affected by our broken immigration system as well.

Mr. JEFFRIES. One of the things that the CBC has attempted to work on, as my distinguished colleague from New York has indicated, is to deal with comprehensive immigration reform in a manner that fixes a broken system for all involved, and we certainly are thankful for the distinguished gentlewoman's work as a member and leader of the CBC task force on immigration reform.

We both proudly represent districts that are incredibly diverse. Back at home in the Eighth Congressional District in Brooklyn and parts of Queens, I represent African Americans, Caribbean Americans, South Asians, Russian-speaking Eastern European Jewish immigrants, Latinos, Chinese Americans, the gorgeous mosaic of the American people. What I found—and this has been the history and the experience, in fact, in New York City—is that immigrants are hardworking, entrepreneurial, spiritual, family-oriented, community-centered individuals. America would be strengthened, of course, by fixing our broken immigration system.

Let me now yield back to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Ms. CLARKE. Let me thank the gentleman from New York for saving me. I have recovered now and would just like to bring forth a few more points.

Working class Americans of all backgrounds, races, and ethnicities are adversely affected with a broken immigration system. As we stated, they are dealing with depressed wages because of unscrupulous and illegal corporate hiring practices. Urban communities aren't even being adequately counted via the census and other surveys, resulting in the reduction of adequate government services and Federal resources to meet the needs of actual populations in our communities, increasing the strain on current public services.

Urban communities are exposed to more crime as the undocumented are more reluctant to report crimes, and African Americans are dealing with increased racial and status discrimination as many are subjected to interrogation based on citizenship.

□ 2130

Imagine our delight, Mr. Speaker, when the immigration reform debate gained some traction this year with the actions taking place in the Senate. There were tangible legislative fixes in the works.

The CBC quickly expressed our concerns to both the House and the Senate leadership over the elimination of the Diversity Visas, used largely by African and Eastern European immigrants.

We voiced our concern over the ability of American children, particularly those from underrepresented and underserved areas to be successful in STEM fields without the proper education, especially since much of the emphasis in the debate relied on increasing incentives of migrants in those fields.

We also expressed the need to address our immigration judicial system. The current state is not aligned with our criminal justice system, leaving many immigrants forced to experience double jeopardy for nonviolent crimes.

We stood up against racial profiling language that does not include religion or national origin and expressed concerns over the switch from family-

based immigration to an economic-based system.

Now, as the House looks to different vehicles to consider comprehensive immigration reform, I implore the House leadership to understand the importance of diversity; that is, racial, ethnic, religious, national, and especially economic diversity, the visa equity that must be afforded immigrants from around the globe.

If we eliminate country caps without including other avenues for smaller countries, we are jeopardizing the beautiful mosaic that makes this country unique and great.

We must evaluate consideration of the SAFE Act, which is a bad idea and a slap in the face to our immigrant history.

Additionally, we have to have an honest conversation about the relationship between legalization and border security. Allowing those who are here a pathway to citizenship but creating an obstacle course based in fear to obtain the citizenship is not the way to go.

We will never realize the true potential of this country if anyone in our society is held back from realizing their individual dreams. And relying heavily on an economic-based immigration system will exclude many immigrants, creating yet another stratified immigration system, forcing people back into the shadows.

That is why, as we look at the next session of the 113th Congress, I ask my colleagues to take the opportunity to revisit these proposals, sans political pressure, sans the haste to get it done, and take a real look at how we can improve the lives of all Americans and all those who strive with the hope to be an American.

Mr. Speaker, we must get this right. Our national security is at stake. Our moral standing in the world depends upon it. The American people, many of whom are first- and second-generation immigrants, have demanded it.

If we turn our backs on those law-abiding contributors to our civil society that come to our shores only to embrace the American Dream, to labor in the rebuilding of our great Nation, strengthen our economy, and to serve honorably in our military, we turn our back on ourselves and our future.

I can definitely say that the CBC Immigration Taskforce looks forward to continuing this conversation into the new year, ensuring that any comprehensive immigration reform measures mirror the diversity of this Nation.

So I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York, whose district is right next to mine in Brooklyn, for yielding time to me today.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from New York for her leadership on this issue, for the progress that has already been made, and her continued commitment.

The CBC, as I close, Mr. Speaker, will continue to take its role seriously as

the conscience of the Congress, a voice for the voiceless, and the guardian of the integrity of the democratic process.

And I am just hopeful, as we move forward, that our friends on the other side of the aisle will end the obfuscation, end the obstruction, end the obsession with the Affordable Care Act, and we can find common ground to advance an agenda for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE CONGRESS THAT KILLED THE PATENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) until 10 p.m.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues, do we want to be known as the Congress that killed the U.S. patent system, a patent system which has served the American people well for 225 years?

I ask America, America, are you listening?

Congress is, once again, talking about reforming the patent system. The last patent reform bill, which passed last year, was the America Invents Act, and it just went into effect earlier this year, and patent lawyers and courts and inventors are still trying to figure out the implications of that change, of the change that that legislation made, and it was the most sweeping change in patent law in the history of our country.

Yet, even before we are able to judge the effects of the America Invents Act, a new patent bill is being rammed through this House and through Congress.

I wish I could focus simply on the bad provisions of this new bill, the Innovation Act. I like to think of it as the Anti-Innovation Act, H.R. 3309, which is expected to be on the floor later this week.

But if the bill is bad, which we are talking about, the process being used to stifle debate and ram this down the congressional throats here on the floor is even worse. In the one Judiciary Committee hearing, witness after witness strongly recommended moving forward slowly, and warned of unintended consequences.

It only takes a few minutes to consider each provision of this bill to see that, although it may be aimed at a single thorn in the side of mega-electronic companies, it will create much more pain in other industries, in higher education, and especially to individual inventors.

In the rush to get H.R. 3309 onto the floor so quickly, it has not been even one single day between when this bill passed the Judiciary Committee and then, thus, becoming available to Members of the House, once it passes the Judiciary Committee, and there

has only not even been one single day of legislative business for Members to consider and submit amendments to the Rules Committee for this important legislation, not one single full day of legislative work, and now this is being rammed down our throats.

And of course, the Thanksgiving holiday happened right after they passed it through the committee. The holiday was right in the middle of a very short time line which, of course, virtually guaranteed that all Members, and most of the staff would not be in Washington, D.C., thus, they passed it right before we left town.

And this schedule suggests what? It suggests that the fix was in. The clear message to little inventors: give thanks for your intellectual property rights because you may not have them this time next year.

Well, this isn't just about rapid, it is also about covert. It seems that we have to pass this bill to find out what is in it. That hasn't worked well for America in the past, and it sure shouldn't be happening again on our watch.

I am calling on my friends and my colleagues who haven't had time to fully understand the implications of this legislation, and that means almost everybody in this body, and we are just back today from the holiday break. If you haven't had time to fully understand the implications of this legislation, join me in demanding a postponement of this vote until after the holiday season, which will give us all sufficient time to consult with our constituents, with experts, and to better understand this legislation and the implications it will have for industry, for American progress, for American inventors and innovators.

Now, to the content of this legislation. We are told this bill is aimed at the threat of so-called patent trolls. These so-called villainous trolls are patent holders, or they are companies who represent patent holders. They are engaged in defending their rights, given to them by ownership of that patent, against the infringement of their patents by someone else.

They own these patents, and these are just as valid as any other patents granted by the Patent Office. But huge corporate infringers would have us believe that these patents are questionable, invalid, unworthy; they are unworthy of being a patent in the first place. Of course, these are the same corporations who have taken these patents and used them without paying the lawful fee that you would pay to someone who invented something that you are using.

Well, this is not the case. They are not paying the inventor, and the patents that are being targeted by these multinational electronics firms as claiming that they are illegitimate, well, most of these were just the product of small inventors. And these small inventors, quite often, because they are

up against mega, multinational corporations, are without a means to defend their rights if these corporations arrogantly decide to violate those patent rights.

And what makes these vilified patents different from the good patents that are owned by these very same large corporations? Well, the so-called patent troll. It happens to be, most of the time, patent trolls are lawyers to take a case on to defend the little guy from theft, but that lawyer didn't invent it. That makes him bad because he is not working for a company, a big mega-company that invents things. No, he is working for a little guy, or he has bought the rights the little man has so that he will get something out of his work.

Well, being out for profit from technology, and from technology that someone did not, he or she, invent themselves, now that is really horrible. Doesn't that sound horrible? Well, no it is not. We live in a society where people litigate to protect their rights, and there is nothing wrong.

We are being told that the patents in question that are going to be dealt with by this legislation, there is a hint that they are not legitimate patents; they are owned by patent trolls. Well, so much for calculated confusion. If the small inventor doesn't have the resources to enforce his or her patent, an individual or company can buy those rights, just like if they don't have the ability to farm, to plant on a farm, they can sell those rights, or they can create a partnership so that they can actually afford to actually protect themselves from being cheated out of their rightful compensation.

I have spoken to independent inventors, conservative political organizations, the American, and all of these people are very suspicious, of course, of these changes that are being put into place in terms of a person's right to litigate to protect their individual rights.

Well, those people are also—there are people who are very suspicious of this legislation, the American Bar Association, industry groups. You have got biotech and pharma, these people, and universities throughout our country who are opposed, or at least very concerned about what is going to happen by H.R. 3309, the so-called Innovation Act, which, as I say, should better be called the Anti-Innovation Act.

Well, we know that this bill, if passed, will further basically further work against the interest, and it will further the disadvantages that the little guys have against deep-pocketed multinational corporations. And this is achieved in the guise, of course, of attacking patent trolls.

See, they have used this word, demonized this word. I happen to have met a person, a man who is a big executive in a major corporation, a major electronics corporation, who was in the meeting with other electronics officials when they coined the phrase, "patent

troll." They were doing it specifically to demonize these lawyers, because they knew they couldn't go after the little inventor or the small inventor or the independent inventor. They couldn't go after him and demonize them, even though they were stealing the patent rights from these individuals, so they would go after the lawyer.

□ 2145

This person was saying that they went around the room with their ideas: What is the most heinous word we could use to help blind the people about what is really going on? He had suggested "patent pirate," but they had decided on "patent troll." Don't be blinded to the theft that is being justified here by demonizing a group of lawyers who are trying to defend small businessmen, basically small inventors.

Proponents of this legislation are demonizing patent lawyers to draw attention away from the fact that they have stolen someone else's patent-protected technology. Now the big guys want to change the system so they can get away with the theft. That is what H.R. 3309 is all about, and that is why it should be called "the Anti-Innovation Act."

It is an aggressive attack on the ability of inventors to defend their ownership rights to the technology they have invented. It is not about frivolous lawsuits or trolls. That is a cynical cover that is being used and was created by the big guys as a license to steal from the little guys.

Former Patent Office Director Kappos and other former directors of the Patent Office have made it clear that we should move slowly about this type of change and with great care when we are making such major changes in the patent law. This legislation is too broad. The simplifications are unclear. The effect is unknowable. That is what witnesses and other experts have indicated. They conclude, "Move forward with caution."

So I ask my colleagues to vote against this bill, but if we can, let's ask our leadership, as I have pleaded with our leadership, to postpone this so we can talk to our educators, talk to the universities, talk to the various employers in our districts, talk to the various people who depend on technology and the technology developed in our country rather than to just go with mega-multinational electronics companies that are guilty of multi-infringement cases as well as antitrust cases.

That is not happening. Congress is being railroaded into passing this legislation right on top of the last legislation. Well, what is going on here? As I say, it is a heavyhanded attempt by mega-multinational corporations to diminish the viability of America's patent system. It has been going on this way—and I have seen this for 25 years.

Strong patent protection has been one of America's greatest assets. It is written into our Constitution. It is the

thing that has given us the ability to have high wages yet be competitive with other societies. It has protected the security of our country and our liberty. That is what strong patent protections have been to us.

But according to the sponsors of H.R. 3309, this isn't really something about undermining the patent system, no; it is undermining the trolls. Just by the fact that everything that they are doing has a major impact on the ability of lawful inventors to protect themselves against infringement, and it diminishes the patent protection that we have had traditionally in this country. Every provision.

Well, what does it do? For the most part, this legislation will make it much more complicated, costly, and challenging to bring a lawsuit against an infringer. For the little guy, it is going to cost him much more to protect his rights.

Well, there you go. These people would like to restrict lawsuits that are totally legitimate to control a few people who have manipulated the system, and thus are abusive lawsuits.

Well, we face this all over. There are many lawyers who are engaged in abusive lawsuits which they shouldn't be filing, but they do. Does that mean that we are going to dramatically limit the rights of the American people to litigate when their rights have been violated by someone else, their property has been taken, or they have been abused and they deserve compensation? No. We are not going to limit those rights. But we will limit the rights of the small inventor and let these big megacorporations take what they want from what this person has invented and not give them compensation for it.

Rather than making it simpler, cheaper, and easier to defend against baseless accusations of infringement—and there are some baseless—what we have done to reduce spurious lawsuits, all we need to do is strengthen the good guys. But this bill weakens the good guys. It weakens ordinary people who are actually contributing a great deal to our country, the independent inventors.

In addition, under the claim of "technical correction," this legislation proposes the removal of the patent system's only independent judicial review process. Section 145 of title 35 in this legislation, if it is enacted, inventors who really believe they have not been treated fairly by the Patent Office—I mean, there may be people in the Patent Office who want to go to work for some major corporation if they decide a certain way, and what they have done, maybe it is not legal. Maybe these things happen in every society, and we need to have a review.

In fact, since 1836, American inventors, if they feel the Patent Office has not dealt with them in a legal way, they have the right to seek independent judicial review. By the way, that right was reaffirmed last year by the Supreme Court in *Kappos versus*

Hyatt, which reaffirmed the importance of that review to maintaining the rights of our inventors. Well, this bill would eliminate that right. It just takes it away, something that has been the right of American inventors since 1836.

I would like to quote my colleague from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, chairman of the Science Committee and former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who is the primary author of the America Invents Act, speaking about new environmental regulations at a Science Committee hearing a few weeks ago:

Our Founders recognized that elections alone may not provide adequate protection for the liberties they fought so hard to establish. They made sure that the Constitution provides a means for the American people to obtain a fair hearing before impartial judges.

This may be one of the most underrated rights Americans enjoy today—the right to judicial review. This proposal is an attempt to prevent judicial review. Americans deserve to understand exactly what this proposal would do and retain the right to challenge it.

In it, Mr. Speaker, he went into how important it is to have judicial review, and that Americans understand how important it is to have not just bureaucrats but a judicial review of what government officials are doing, and how important that is to our freedom.

Well, I would say to the gentleman from Texas, Yes, Mr. SMITH, I would agree. He is the chairman of my committee, the Science Committee. I am the vice chairman of the Science Committee.

We disagree on this bill, but I will say that this is an important part of the bill. H.R. 3309 would eliminate the ability for the court to review what these government officials are doing in their job if they hurt another individual. Mr. SMITH thinks that is important when it comes to the environment. I think it is important for the environment and for protecting our inventors. This principle applies just as certainly, as I say, to patent review as it does to environmental regulations.

Now the Patent Office officials have requested, of course, that they don't want to have that judicial review. Why is it? Because they say it is too burdensome. Never mind that very few people have such claims. But we are going to eliminate that right and that option because it is inconvenient for our bureaucracy. That is absurd. For that reason alone, this bill should be defeated.

The legislation going before the House this week is consistent with a decades-long war being waged on America's independent inventors. Here are a few of the provisions of the bill:

It will create more paperwork. When an inventor has to file an infringement claim, it dramatically increases the paperwork necessary for him to file the claim, and, thus, it is not any more expensive, but it increases the possibility that his claim will just be denied out of some technical mistake in the paperwork.

The Innovation Act will switch us to a "loser pays" system. Now, of course, "loser pays" sounds pretty good. That means, if you file a bad suit or something or you lose a suit, the loser is going to pay the legal expenses for the winner. What does that do when you have little guy against big guy, the small inventor versus mega-multibillion dollar international corporation? What it does is say, if a little guy sues the corporation and loses, that is nothing. Paying his legal expenses are absolutely nothing for this big corporation. But if he loses to the corporation, that corporation will have piled on legal expenses that will destroy the economic viability of that small inventor. It is little guy versus big guy. In this case, making the loser pay is a big advantage to the big guy at the expense of the little guy.

What is unfortunate, this bill goes even further than that. This bill will allow the court to bring others into the case as plaintiffs if they have an interest in the patent. So if someone is invested in the person's patent—in the little guy's patent—they have invested in it, and they lose a lawsuit trying to enforce their rights to have compensation for the use of what they have invented, if they lose that suit, the person who is invested with the little guy, he is going to be liable for this massive bill that these big companies are bound to pile on. So this "loser pays" system has some attraction but, in reality, will be a disaster for the little guy trying to enforce his rights.

We have also in this bill that it would create new requirements that the patent holder, once filing a claim for infringement, must provide information about all parties who have an interest in the patent. Thus, what we have is a list that even the infringer will have. So this man, a small businessman, an inventor, will then have all of his business dealings then basically be made public, and his enemies will have that list to go after. This would have destroyed Thomas Edison. This would have destroyed our great inventors of the past. There are people who don't want to put themselves in public view in order to get behind new inventions. This means the total elimination of privacy in dealing with businesses.

Of course, we have another requirement in here that basically is a reporting requirements for the little guy. We have bureaucratic fees that are being forced on the little guy to maintain records that they now don't have to maintain. Thus, you have the situation where the little guy has to have the expense of maintaining a bunch of records, and these things now are just yet another stumbling block.

One of the other restrictions on the little guy is, if he files a suit against the big guys, there is a thing called discovery. Well, everybody else can have discovery, but these little patent guys, these little inventors, if they are filing a suit against a major infringer, not

only do you have to be so specific about what you want—we have replaced a system where there will be one motion—we replaced it, which will require dozens of motions, each motion costing the little inventor tens of thousands of dollars in legal fees.

We are upping the cost, upping the cost, upping the cost, complications, and legal ramifications of a man or woman protecting his or her patent that is a legitimate patent all in the name of getting those terrible trolls, and the troll might not even be involved in this. There might not be any lawyer who is volunteering or is investing in this project.

So what we have got, of course, is another thing where the person is there—you may call him a troll, but now the small business and education outreach part of this is, it authorizes the Patent Office director to create a patent troll database. That means that anybody who goes out to help these small inventors is going to be on a database. I guess you shouldn't really call that a database. Let's call that an enemies list. Because that is probably what it would be used for. Oh, no; that list was going to be made—here are the people you should stay away from. No, these aren't people guilty of crimes. These are people who have engaged in taking on powerful economic interests that are stealing the economic rights of our small inventors.

As I mentioned earlier, it also eliminates the judicial review that we have had since 1836 for our inventors.

Is there anything that could be more of an attack on the well-being of America's inventors? This, as I say, is a consistent pattern that I have seen for 25 years, where what we call "globalists" who are trying to take America's strong patent system and weaken it so that we will not have the advantage that we have had throughout the world.

In the beginning, these people wanted to take fundamental parts of our patent system so that patents, even before they would be issued to the inventor, that they would be published for the whole world to see. That is what these people have been trying to get away with. Year after year after year, they whittle away at the patent protection of our people because they want a global system that is run by international, multinational companies.

The people running those companies, do you think they are loyal to the people of the United States of America? Do you think they have our interests in mind as compared to a small inventor who loves the freedom and liberty that our country offers and understands that in another country, he won't have that same freedom? No, it has been the small inventor.

It has been technological development that has given Americans the standard of living, the security, and the freedom that we have enjoyed, and now this body, we are having a bill rammed down our throats. It has been

rammed through the system. Why? Because they don't want us to fully understand the implications of this bill, H.R. 3309, the Innovation Act, which will kill the small American inventors in this country.

I would ask that our leadership consider postponing this so the American people will have a chance to get a hold of their Congressman, their Representative, so that we will talk and find out what the real effect of H.R. 3309 will have. I ask my colleagues in closing: Do we want to be known as the Congress that killed the U.S. patent system which has served the American people so well for 225 years?

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of the birth of her daughter.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on November 21, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 3204. To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1848. To ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 1 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 3, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Report concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third quarter of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 is as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jason Chaffetz	8/26	8/28	S. Korea		535.07						535.07
	8/28	8/30	Vietnam		480.18						480.18
	8/30	9/1	Singapore		682.00						682.00
Commercial airfare							12,493.40				12,493.40
Delegation expenses								754.81			754.81
James Lewis	8/26	8/28	S. Korea		561.07						561.07
	8/28	8/30	Vietnam		531.18						531.18
	8/30	9/1	Singapore		924.00						924.00
							12,457.60				12,457.60
Hon. Darrell Issa	9/23	9/23	Italy								
	9/23	9/24	Malta		325.00						325.00
	9/24	9/24	Libya								
	9/24	9/25	Egypt		268.00						268.00
Commercial airfare							13,941.50				13,941.50
Delegation expenses								879.07			879.07
James Lewis	9/23	9/23	Italy								
	9/23	9/24	Malta		278.00						278.00
	9/24	9/24	Libya								
	9/24	9/25	Egypt		268.00						268.00
Commercial airfare							13,393.40				13,393.40
Committee total					4,852.50		52,285.90		1,633.88		58,772.28

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA, Chairman, Oct. 31, 2013.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3975. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Revisions to Payment Policies under the Physician Fee Schedule, Clinical Laboratory Fee Schedule & Other Revisions to Part B for CY 2014 [CMS-1600-FC] (RIN: 0938-AR56) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

3976. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs: Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment Systems and Quality Reporting Programs; Hospital Value-Based Purchasing Program; Organ Procurement Organizations; Quality Improvement Organizations; Elec-

tronic Health Records (EHR) Incentive Program; Provider Reimbursement Determinations and Appeals [CMS-1601-FC] (RIN: 0938-AR54) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

(The following action occurred on November 25, 2013)

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 3381. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other

purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

(Submitted December 2, 2013)

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1204. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3309. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 298. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct

a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Mill Springs Battlefield located in Pulaski and Wayne Counties, Kentucky, and the feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1241. A bill to facilitate a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Inyo National Forest, and for other purposes; (Rept. 113-281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1846. A bill to amend the Act establishing the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 3625. A bill to provide for termination liability costs for certain National Aeronautics and Space Administration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 3626. A bill to extend the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 for 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 3627. A bill to require the Attorney General to report on State law penalties for certain child abusers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 3628. A bill to eliminate certain unnecessary reporting requirements and consolidate or modify others, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 3629. A bill to affirm United States recognition of Israel's sovereignty, security, and legal right to its lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 3630. A bill to establish a research program under the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program of the Department of Defense to discover a cure for HIV/AIDS; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURT (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 3631. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to waive or reduce certain fees applicable to generic drug facilities where the fees would present a significant barrier to market entry because of limited resources available to such facilities or other circumstances; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

H.R. 3632. A bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. LYNCH):

H. Res. 428. A resolution urging the president to release information regarding the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks upon the United States; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 3625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to enact legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 3627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 3628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (related to general Welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes), and Clause 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;), and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 3630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 3631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 3632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation reallocates the number of federal judgeships and, as such, follows the responsibility that Congress has, under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9 to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 32: Mr. COHEN and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 107: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 139: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 543: Mr. CRAMER and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 580: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 596: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 721: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 915: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JONES, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 917: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 946: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 974: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 997: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1015: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1150: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1209: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SCALISE, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1252: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1310: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1337: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1354: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1428: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1465: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1554: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1563: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1565: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1609: Mr. MORAN and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1629: Mr. VARGAS and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1630: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1652: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1666: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1716: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1726: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. LANCE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1732: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1738: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1774: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 1775: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1798: Mr. JONES.

- H.R. 1830: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1832: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1869: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1875: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1950: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 1981: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2016: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2018: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2041: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2066: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2085: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 2103: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2134: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2163: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2224: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. CHU, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2237: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2249: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2330: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2502: Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2509: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2520: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2540: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2548: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SIRES, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2575: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 2632: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2663: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2676: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2717: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 2725: Mr. CARTER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2807: Mr. HIMES, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2893: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2907: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2939: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2959: Mr. OLSON, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2989: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2990: Mr. HOLT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2998: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3025: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3038: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3040: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3043: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3077: Mr. MARINO and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3090: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 3111: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3138: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3169: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 3179: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3206: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 3274: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3303: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3312: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 3357: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3371: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3374: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 3385: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3397: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3413: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3461: Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 3472: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MENG, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3485: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3488: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3489: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 3490: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 3495: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3501: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. FARR, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 3507: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3508: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3531: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 3541: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 3546: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3573: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 3578: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3584: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 3612: Mr. CUMMINGS and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.J. Res. 98: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H. Res. 98: Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 284: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. GIBSON.
H. Res. 302: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H. Res. 401: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 407: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 417: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. COLE.
H. Res. 425: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. MULLIN.